HINDU NATIONALISM IN INDIA

4

NON-CONVENTIONAL SCHOOL

D.D. PATTANAIK

Foreword by

PROFESSOR M.M. SANKHDHER
Former Professor of Political Science,
University of Delhi, Delhi.

DEEP & DEEP PUBLICATIONS
F-159, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi-110027

BL
1215
.P65
P38
1998
V.4

ISBN 81-7629-075-0 (Vol. 4)
ISBN 81-7629-076-9 (Set)

© 1998 D.D. PATTANAIK

All rights reserved with the Publisher, including the right to translate or to reproduce this book or parts thereof except for brief quotations in critical articles or reviews.

Typeset by ASHISH TECHNOGRAPHICS, 3190, Mohindra Park, Shakur Basti, Delhi-110034.

Printed in India at ELEGANT PRINTERS, A-38/2, Mayapuri, Phase I, New Delhi-110064

Published by DEEP & DEEP PUBLICATIONS, F-159, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi-110027. Phones : 5435369, 5440916

Grad
PL480-SA
11-19-98

Dedicated to:
Professor Rajendra Singh—Mananiya Rajju Bhaiya—
Sarsanghchalak
Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh

CONTENTS

	Foreword	ix
	Preface	xxi
	Prologue	1
1.	Mahatma Gandhi	5
2.	Subhas Chandra Bose	2
3.	Rajendra Prasad	39
4.	Vallabh Bhai Patel	51
5.	Bhim Rao Ambedkar	64
6.	S. Radhakrishnan	82
	To End. . .	99
	Bibliography	110
	Index	116

FOREWORD

Perhaps it is never too late to learn from the mistakes of the past and begin afresh. I think it would now be appropriate, after 50 years of Independence, in the midst of turmoil, to assess where we have gone wrong. For, it is obvious to everyone that the country is in a total mess and a decline in all walks of life has set in. No doubt, it is difficult to identify a single cause for the decline on all fronts—social, economic, educational, political, moral and intellectual—one cannot avoid generalization or the necessity of a paradigm-shift after investigating the complex phenomena of degeneration. Even at the risk of contradiction, I daresay that misconcepts about India's reality have caused the greatest havoc to the understanding of our people, their psyche, ethos and aspirations, the way of life and the accepted value-system.

If India has to emerge as a great country in the foreseeable future, for which, unfortunately, there are very few indicators, the first task, to may mind, is to check, what can be called, *mantra-viplav*, i.e., the word-explosion. Our whole political vocabulary has to be reshaped, revised and reconcepted. Roughly, for over a century, unending storming of wrongly motivated phraseology, emanating from western and communist sources, has gone unchallenged. This kind of language has warped the intellect and has landed us in our present plight. Our sights are not clear, our visions are blurred and like half-blind we are groping in infra-regions of illusions, deceptions and rigmarole.

"O India! O perfect Nation!
O India that shall be!
How long till thou take station?"

—*Annie Besant*

We have drifted from our moorings and have been chasing false ideals. We have chosen to follow the communist or the western liberal paradigms to the complete neglect of our own. The adoption of western model of nationalism and the communist model of multi-nationalism is one supreme example of our misdirection of goals. Nationalism, born of European experiences, and multi-nationalism, the creed of the Soviet Union—both have shown disastrous results respectively in terms of world wars, on the one hand, and the breakup of the Soviet Union, on the other. Nationalism precisely meant freedom from colonialism, self-determination and a unity of some common material interests. At best, it meant a self-governing community for agreed common goals.

Inspired by the liberal ideology of the west and reinforced by the American love for freedom, we, too, during our fight for Independence initated the same pattern of thinking and action thereafter. For fifty odd years we did nothing by way of introspection to take the right path or formulate positive goals for charting a course destined for us. Lamentably, patriotism remained a forgotton creed and western nationalism became our true political religion.

Nationalism, brought in its train, problems of diversities, disintegration, separatism, secessionism and terrorism. Nationalism implied a process of appeasement of minorities and brought to fore the concepts of composite culture and multiplicity of religions and minorities. It tended to infuse a sinister self-conscious identity in smaller groups and diffused the prime loyalty to the country as a whole. Instead of emphasising the unifying forces and strengthening them, the ideology of multi-nationalism encouraged attacks on the very cultural

mainstream. Pseudo-secularism, thus, is the inevitable product of the foreign concept of nationalism that we wove into our constitutional fabric.

One of the most serious fallouts of our acute dependence on foreign terminology was the confusion of our traditional concept of *Rashtra* with the word *Nation* of foreign origin. *Rashtra*, misconstrued as Nation, like *Dharma* translated as Religion, created a whole lot of semantic misunderstandings, deviating and alienating us from the reality of our original thought processes. The Hindu version of *Rashtra* is not the same thing as the Nation. These two words carry different nuances, spirit, connotation and implications. The two words cannot be used interchangeably nor are they synonymous. The overlapping of these two words has done enormous damage to conceptual clarity.

The distinction between Nation and *Rashtra* is lost to our view. This has caused the term *Rashtra-bhakti* to erroneously mean loyalty to the nation rather than patriotism. The sense conveyed by the phrase *Desh-bhakti* is swept aside. Patriotism, in my view, evokes a very different sentiment than nationalism. The pure love for the country, as a whole, is the feeling behind the word *Rashtra*. The love for the country and its cultural unity is not the same thing as striving for nationhood, self-determination, sovereignty or structuring of a composite culture.

Aurobindo explains:

> "But what is a nation? The *Shakti* of its Millions. What is a nation? What is our mother country? It is not a piece of earth, nor a figure of speech, nor a fiction of the mind. It is a mighty *Shakti*. . . . Come then, hearken to the call of the Mother. She is already in our hearts waiting to manifest herself, waiting to be worshipped."

"India is the *Bharat Shakti*—the living energy of a great spiritual conception, and fidelity to it is the very principle of her existence."

Mother I bow to thee!
Rich with thy hurrying streams,
Bright with thy orchard gleams,
Cool with thy winds of delight,
Dark fields waring, Mother of might,
Mother free. . . . !

"I am not feeling this only today that nationalism is a faith. It is a *Dharma*. I mean to say that *Sanatan Dharma* is itself nationalism for us. Hindu *Rashtra* was born with *Sanatan Dharma* and prospers with *Dharma*. Whenever *Sanatan Dharma* degenerates, nation also suffers. *Sanatan Dharma* is identical with nationalism."

—*Aurobindo*

From Kabul-Kandhar (Afghanistan), to Brahmdesh (Myanmar), Siam (Thailand) and Shailendra Dweep Samooh (Indonesia): from Kashmir to Kanyakumari: from Himalayas, Kailash, Mansarovar, Karakoram, Hindukush: from Sindhu Sagar (Arabian Sea), Ganga Sagar (Bay of Bengal), Hind Mahasagar (Indian Ocean), and Singhal Dweep (Sri Lanka), from Brahmputra to Sindhu, Panchnad, Ganga, Yamuna, Mahanadi, Kaveri, Saraswati, Narmada, Godavari, Krishna, Reva and Gandaki—this is eternal, *Sanatana-Dharmabhumi, Matrabhumi, Pitrabhumi, Punyabhumi, Tapobhumi* and *Karmabhumi* of the *Rishis* of yore, inherited by the Hindus; known in legends and scriptures as *Bharat-Khand, Bharat-Varsh* or *Jamboo Dweep.*

देवि भुवनमोहिनी नीलसिन्धु जलधौत चरणवत
पृथिव्या समुद्रपर्यताया एकराट्
उत्तर यत्समुद्रस्य हिमाद्रेश्चैव दक्षिणम् ।
वर्ष तद् भारत नाम भारती यत्र संतति ।।
हिमवत्समुद्रान्तर मुदीचीन योजनसहस्त्र परिमाणम् ।
समुद्र इव गाम्भीर्ये धैर्येण हिमवान् इव ।

—Rabindra Nath Tagore

The inspirational literature comprises, mainly: The *Vedas, Upanishads, Puranas, Epics, Digh-Nikaya, Dharamsastra, Arthsastra, Thiru-Kural, Guru-granth Sahab*, and *Jain Scriptures*.

The holy centres of this geo-cultural entity are: Ayodhya, Mathura, Kashi, Haridwar, Kanchi, Avantika, Vaishali, Dwarika, Puri, Takshila, Gaya, Prayag, Patliputra, Vijaynagar, Indraprastha, Somnath, Amritsar, Badrinath, Kedarnath, Amarnath.

Hindu nationalism is pure patriotism. It is *Rastratva*: selfless love for the divine land, rivers, hills, forests, animals, humans at different levels of consciousness—from material to spiritual. It is spiritual-cultural-integral nationalism.

The name of the nation, Bharat, originates from king Bharat who was noble, virtuous, victorious king and shining model of Hindu manhood. When a woman has more than one child, we call her by the name of her eldest or most well known among her children. Bharat was well known and this land was called as mother. Bharat—the mother of all Hindus. Golwalkar contended that India was one nation, one people, one culture, since earliest time in human annals. He used to quote the trumpet cry of the *Vedas*—

पुण्याहवाचन अथर्ववेद
भद्रं इच्छान्त ऋषयः स्वर्विदः
तपो दीक्षा उपसेदुः अग्रे ।
ततो राष्ट्रं बलं ओजञ्च जातम् ।
तदस्मै देवा उपसं नमन्तु ।।
(अथर्व-19/41/1)

"Overall the land up to the oceans, one nation
Long ago our forefathers sang:
The land to the north of the oceans and south of

the Himalayas is called *Bharatavarsha*, and *Bharatis* are her children.

—*M.S. Golwalkar*

"Chanakya, who has been held an authority on political science, has stated:

To the north of the oceans upto the Himalayas, the country is thousand yojanas in length."

Dattopant Thengde in राष्ट्र

As the most ancient people on earth, we have been more preoccupied with our commitments to the advancement and strengthening of our cherished values, codes of ethical beliefs and modes of search for truth. In other words, we have evolved a distinct way of life and a distinct identity. We have our own perceptions of destiny and role *vis-a-vis* mankind, and indeed, the whole universe. We have a philosophy and a synthetic worldview. We have sought and found answers to a whole lot of questions about life and existence. We have discovered God from an open mind and pursued the search for God without being fanatic or fundamentalist. We have a unique character and genius and an enlarged vision of *Sarvadharma-samabhava*. To preserve and strengthen these values and life-guidelines is patriotism, a duty that devolves on us as Hindus.

वन्देमातरम्, सुजलाम्, सुफलाम्,
मलयज शीतलाम् सस्यशामलाम्, मातरम् ।
शुभ्र ज्योत्स्ना, पुलकित यामिनीम्,
फुल्कुसुमित, द्रुमदल शोभिनीम् सुहासिनीय सुमधुर भाषिणीम्,
सुखदाम्, वरदाम्, मात्तरम्, वन्देमातरम् ।

—*Bankim Chandra Chatterjee*

The Hindu catholicity of outlook and the accompanying tolerance has been a great asset, but now-

a-days it is also showing the need for revision, especially in the face of hostile and pseudo-secularist forces who try to exploit this virtue as a weakness. The Hindus have been glorious people but they have fallen on evil days. Inculcation of patriotic spirit among the Hindus is a *sine qua non* for turning other converts from Hinduism to return into the Hindu fold. During the course of history, Hinduism—a great civilisation—has been polluted by alien influences. It is a curious phenomenon that Hinduism which had a tremendous capacity to assimilate alien cultures or sub-cultures has failed to do so in the case of Muslims, although they too are originally Hindus.

ज्योस्तुते श्रीमहन्मंगले शिवास्पदे शुभदे ।
स्वतंत्रते भगवति त्वामहम् यशोयुता वन्दे ।।

हे भगवति स्वतन्त्रतादेवि, तेरी जय हो,
हे महान मंगलमयि, कल्याणमयि, शुभंकारी,
देवि, तेरी यशारचिता को मैं वन्दन करता हूँ ।
तुम सूर्य का तेज हो, तुम सागर जैसी गम्भीर हो ।
तुम्हें मैं वन्दन करता हूँ ।।

—V.D. Savarkar

A country, which has the immense potential to lead the entire humanity, is suffering under its own heels. A helplessness seems to have overtaken our society to face the challenges of religious fanaticism, secessionism, terrorism, communalism, and separatism. Economically, the country has been reduced to the status of a beggar surviving on the mercy of international finance. Patriotism alone is the anodyne for the serious maladies, for it demands a complete loyalty to the country and expects supreme sacrifice for the cause. Adherence to the interest of the country and the readiness to face all the challenges and crises is a part of the virtue of patriotism.

The Hindus have, over the ages, transmitted patriotism from generation to generation, imbibing in the

masses an unflinching devotion to the country as a whole. The word *Rashtra* signifies the country and all that it represents as a heritage, culture, tradition. *Desh-bhakti* is a call to the people to be prepared to give up every comfort when faced with inimical forces both inside and outside the country. *Rashtra* is not a mere geo-political concept, it is a category of thought which mystically keeps a patriot in a frame of mind to transcend all material and immediate interests and protect the motherland from all odds, calamities, aggressions and evils.

According to Dr. Bali Ram Hedgewar, patriotism is a cultural urge manifest in all beings in this country to treat everything the motherland has given to them as a blessing and a boon. It is an outer expression of *sanskara*—a subconscious feeling in every heart of a Hindu whose heart bleeds when the country suffers. The Hindu is one who would consider no price big enough for saving the country from disintegration and sabotage. For, in the protection of the country, he is seeking the protection of all that he has cherished and is indispensable to him as a responsible citizen. Patriotism, in this context, is a civilisational concern for the Hindu who is ever prepared to arm himself for fighting against all anti-patriotic forces, the way Ram waged a war against Ravan.

In this sense, patriotism invokes a greater emotional attachment to the motherland than nationalism can ever do. The mother and the motherland are both higher than heavens. Patriotism, unlike nationalism, involves a total dedication to the *Desh* or *Rashtra*.

जननी जन्मभूमिश्च ।
स्वर्गादपि गरीयसी ।।

—Valmiki *Ramayana*

A patriot is spirited in love for anything that the *Rashtra* bestows on him by its benign benevolence and grace. It makes all the difference when this attachment is accompanied by reverence to values of universalism, humanity and humanness. The *Rashtra* acquires for him

sublime heights in terms of his willingness to accept loyalty, not governed by narrow economic benefits, political privileges, and security. His perfect atunement with the elevated consciousness, where a sense of belonging embraces the land, the geography, the mountains, the rivers, the art, the oceans, the flora and fauna, legends and scriptures, and above all, the wonderful people.

मन समर्पित, तन समर्पित और यह जीवन समर्पित
चाहता हूँ मातृ-भू ! तुझको अभी कुछ और भी दूँ ।।

—*R.S.S. Song*

The persistent and notorious tirade launched by pseudo-secularist elements to denounce patriotism as revivalist, communal and obscurantist needs to be strongly countered by propagating positive concepts of the Hindu classical tradition in order to invoke a sense of pride in the glory of our ancient civilisation. Propagation of patriotism all over the country would reflect the people's desire and resolve to build up the most modern and scientific edifice on the *Shastra* foundation. Tradition and modernity are now to be blended in a unique fashion, not attempted so far. The age-old lesson of keeping the country from Kanyakumari to Kashmir united has to be drilled into ears of the masses who are otherwise sought to be deflected from their righteous party by ill-motivated politicians and a bunch of misguided scholars who have, without a feeling of shame, distorted all that is noble in our culture.

जननी जगन्मात की, प्रखर मातृभक्ति की,
सुप्त भावना जगाने हम चले ।।
सदैव से महान जो सदैव ही महान हो,
कोटि-कोटि कंठ से अखण्ड वंद्य गान हो,
मातृ-भू की अमरता समृद्धि औ अखंण्डता की
शुभ्र कामना जगाने हम चले
जननी जगन्मात की . . .।। १।।

—*R.S.S. Song*

The crusade for people's regeneration, for which the soil is well prepared, should inject an emotional nimbus for the consolidation of constructive forces who want the country to be taken to the pinnacle of glory.

नमस्ते सदा वत्सले मातृभूमे
त्वया हिन्दुभूमे सुखं बर्धितोऽहम् ।
महामङ्गले पुण्यभूमे त्वदर्थे
पतत्वेष कायो नमस्ते नमस्ते ।। १।।
प्रभो शक्तिमन् हिन्दुराष्ट्राङ्गभूता
इसे सादरं त्वां नमामो वयम्
त्वदीयाय कार्याय बद्धा कटीयम्
शुभामाशिषं देहि तत्पूर्तये ।
अजय्यां च विश्वस्य देहीश शक्तिम्
सुशीलं जगद् येन नम्रं भवेत्
श्रुतं चैव यत् कण्टकाकीर्णमार्गम्
स्वयं स्वीकृतं नः सुगङ्कारयेत् ।। २ ।।
समुत्कर्ष निः श्रेयसस्यैकमुग्रम्
परम् साधनं नाम वीरव्रतम्
तदन्तः स्फुरत्वक्षया ध्येयनिष्ठा
हृदन्तः प्रजागर्तु तीव्राऽनिशम् ।
विजेत्री च नः संहता कार्यशक्तिर्
विधायास्य धर्मस्य संरक्षणम्
परं वैभवं नेतुमेतत् स्वराष्ट्रम्
समर्था भवत्वाशिषा ते भृशम् ।। ३।।

—*R.S.S. Prayer*

That is, the love of the country *per se* is like the love of the mother and is heavenly! This love is selfless and involves a steadfast commitment to service and sacrifice. The preparation of every son of this land to sacrifice his life represents the conventional wisdom distilled out of both the *Dharmashastra* and the *Arthashastra* schools.

Therefore, we have not only to unlearn the false lessons of the recent past *via* nationalism imposed on us by alien ideologies, we have to relearn our forgotton lessons drawn from our own rich scriptural sources. The concepts of *Rashtra-bhakti* and *Desh-seva* have to be rendered in a new idiom and vocabulary. The whole language of politics which abuses *Bharat* as India is to be changed, and the shackles of intellectual slavery removed.

All the patriotic forces have to be mobilised for launching a massive public education crusade spirited in *Vande Mataram.* With a missionary zeal we have to disabuse the minds of the younger generations of the distortions perpetrated by misguided leaders and intellectuals of the Left variety.

Let us chant 'Vandemataram'
Let us pray to Mother India.

We are not for caste or creed;
be they Brahmins or not,
they are great, because they are sons of this blessed soil.

Let us chant 'Vandemataram'.
Let us pray to Mother India.

—*Subramanian Bharati*

The people are to be brought back, after centuries of serfdom, into the mainstream of the vibrant, rich intellectual culture bequeathed to us by our ancestors. The task is to resurrect *Bharat* from India, *Dharma* from Religion and *Dharam Sapekshawad* from Secularism. It is also to work out the principles of *Vasudheva Kutumbakam* and *Sarva Dharma Samabhava* in a world still not properly enlightened to grasp these truths. Above all, *Rashtratwa* has to be rescued from the clutches of West-oriented Nationalism. This, indeed, is the new

paradigm of thinking meant to demobilise the cancerous elements eating into the vitals of our rich heritage and enlightened intellectual culture inspired by spiritual experiences of the saints and sages of yore.

The indegeneous perspective gets strengthened in Dr. D.D. Pattanaik's four-volume work on *Hindu Nationalism in India.* He has studiously traced all the basic sources to build up an original thesis based on authentic evidence. In the present stage of our knowledge when unpardonable distortions prevail in Indian historiography, Dr. Pattanaik's volumes blaze a new trail in restoring to the concept of nationalism its pristine glory. Several intellectual cobwebs in our understanding of India's culture, which is predominantly Hindu, get sweeped away. Dispassionate scholars would welcome this production. This work will set a pace for positive and creative thinking on the indological phenomenon so widely and deeply probed.

Delhi

M.M. SANKHDHER
Professor of Political Science, (Retd.)
University of Delhi

PREFACE

India, the most ancient land of the world, endowed with rich culture, art, literature and philosophy, has been continuing with all her vital impulse. Her inherent potentiality lies with sublime heritage and veritable tradition. In this long span of her chequered history she has presented a definite way of life, and that lies with Hinduness. The Hindus thus constitute the substratum of India's national life. But unfortunately she has been subjected to a great deal of misrepresentation and apprehension. For instance, 'Dharma' has been equated with religious denomination. Every nation has its own language to express her heart and soul, and consequently every term and concept cannot be exactly translated into other languages conveying the same meaning. This kind of attempt seriously jeopardized and confused the national life in the Indian context.

It is not only the linguistic jugglery that brought Hindu way of life, Hindu nationalism and all that to utter misgiving, but certain phenomena, occurrences, deliberate distortions without and inertia within, led to ensure abberation in the annals of history. Ironically, though this is the ancient land with profound richness and genius, the country was exposed to repeated pillage paving the way for imposed rule and rape of indigenous life[1] for more than

1. Proclamation of Mahammed Bin Quasim, Mahammed of Ghazni and others following invasion of India. (Ambedkar, B.R., quotes Dr. Titus, Medieval India, pp. 10-26, in Pakistan, or Partitioning of India, pp. 35-47).

thousand years. While it may be interpreted as catholicity of Indian life-style, it also exhibits the feebleness of the native people so much so that it led them to decay and decadence in times to come. Compounded together, they lacked introspection, confidence, self-dignity, self-pride, and became oblivious of their past. The overall picture by early nineteenth century was that what was called India had crumbled down abysmally—people becoming sluggish emaciated with dogmatic rituals, prejudices and social ignominies. It is at this juncture that India threw up a series of great savants ensuing motion of history swerving on the right track.

The attempt here is to define nationalism, probe its origin, and arrive at the conclusion of Hindu foundation of Indian nationalism, which is distinguished from theocracy and free from any narrow shackle of regimentation as demonstrated by the great thinkers and activists since nineteenth century in a sincere bid to harmonise and rationalise them in a proper perspective. There is a lack of a crystallised work on the concept and trend of Hindu nationalism with reference to modern India. Though work on Indian thinkers and varied schools of thought is made available in library-shelves, it has been a matter of great intellectual stir to discern the entire panorama of Hindu nationalistic ideas, movements and successive developments in a consolidated spectrum. I hope this is accomplished in the present work.

This is not a work on history as such, though historical references beset it. The present work is primarily historical, and hence empirical. It is also comparative and philosophical whenever the context demands. Since it is not a purely historical work, it is very often not chronological. Certain points have often been repeated in certain phases to make the given point relevant. Precisely, this is a macro study synthesising political history, political thought, dynamics of political theory and contemporary politics.

Though basically there are two dimensions of the present work, viz., the concept, and the trend of Hindu nationalism, there is no strict cleavage between the two while presenting. They are inextricably related, and therefore, arranged in a pattern scattered over four volumes.

Volume 1 deals with the critical theoretical and ideological aspects of nationalism, both from western and Hindu nationalist standpoints—with adequate explanation of expression 'Hindu' and whatever it implies. It is accompanied with the vexed problem of secularism and national integration. Volume 2 deals with the trend of Hindu nationalism in modern India. It must be clarified that when the term trend is used it comprises the entire wavelength of the ideas expressed and movements launched right from the last quarter of nineteenth century to the present day. In other words, it tends to establish continuity in the whole epoch. It also reflects the conceptual dimension. Volume 3 explains the ideal and characteristics of Hindu nationalism deducible from its own genesis. It has been divided into two Parts. The first attempts to clarify the aspersions cast by the critics, which erases various misreadings pertaining to it. The second is a humble bid to explore their distinct perception and emphasis on diverse issues and ideals entailing their cause. Hence, the first Part has been termed as the Negative aspects while the second Part as the Positive aspects. Volume 4 comprises the ideas of the thinkers of non-formal school—which means, those not technically clubbed with the Hindu nationalists, but whose ideas send feelers on Hindu foundation of India. They are obviously the stalwarts of freedom struggle.

I avail this opportunity to express deep gratitude to Prof. Balraj Madhok, Sri. K.S. Sudarshan, Sri K.R. Malkani, Prof. Devendra Swaroop, Thakur Ram Singh and Prof. M.M. Sankhdher—all outstanding luminaries in the given field, for their encouragement to crop up this work. I am also indebted to Indian Council of Social

Science Research, Calcutta, for its grant, and Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, for the Associate Fellowship made available to the author to pursue this work. I am obliged to Deendayal Research Institute and RSS Archives, New Delhi, for their assistance. I would like to extend special thanks to Dr. A.P. Padhi, Senior-most Professor in Political Science, Sambalpur University, and President, Indian Political Science Association, for his wide-ranging guidance to accomplish this work as a post-doctorate thesis.

Last but not the least, Dr. M.M. Sankhdher, retired Professor in Political Science, University of Delhi and an internationally known scholar, who deserves sincere acclamation; but for whom this work could not have been available in black and white.

So many other persons in the academic and public field have appreciated my venture serving as elixir. Heartfelt thanks to them all.

Finally, I thank Mr. G.S. Bhatia of Deep & Deep Publications for doing a good job in time.

Sambalpur D.D. PATTANAIK

PROLOGUE

The postulation "non-conventional school" is being expressed at the moment esoterically. Political ideas of the classical school of Hindu nationalism has been deliberated in Volume 2. But the thinkers who are being dealt with in the present volume are not veritably or technically the subscribers of Hindu nationalism. However, in essence they have amply demonstrated their conviction on Hindu foundation of Indian nationalism expressly and tacitly. It can be deduced from the hypothesis that they are religious from the very core of heart, and their religion reflects sublime Hinduism. While it is compounded with patriotic fervour it vindicates the Hindu root of Indian nationalism. It besets their emphasis on Indian culture and tradition in greater historical perspective, beside other transparent features of Hindu nationalism.

The aforementioned contention is buttressed by certain analyses. Ravinder Kumar observes, "The Constitution of 1935 reflected the recognition by the root of the great body of Hindu opinion organised under the aegis of the Congress; the minorities more particularly the Muslim. . . stood outside the frame-work of the Congress."[1] Again he mentions, ". . . In six provinces of British India, which had a Hindu majority, Congress candidates won clear victories in the provincial elections of 1937."[2] Perusal study of the history of Indian National Congress unfolds the vision that the wavelength of Hindu culture constituted the wavelength of Congress culture.

A critic on the same aspect is given to understand that "what was needed was a more comprehensive attempt to set out a wider range of indigenous—that is, primarily Hindu values which could be regarded as consistently informing and shaping the country's political culture."[3]

The Gandhian era of anti-colonial movement carried the legacy of a fractured social complexion, decomposed elite class, crude middle class and incessant communal passion. The statesmen emerging out of this kind of debris had to bear the brunt. As a matter of sequel they had to choose distinct alternate platform. Aberration may be there, but the movers of the wheel of history of the time were not divorced from the mainstream of Indian nationalism rolling down since millennia. Their subjective beliefs, life-style and reaction to given situations justify the sum-total of Hindu nationalism. Beside this basic fact, there are other characteristics, typical of course, as explained in Volume 3 of the present work which do find striking resemblance with the thinkers and activists dealt herewith. A critical and comparative study is of imperative necessity in order to explain these dimensions objectively since this near past has profound bearing with the present and the future of Indian nationalism.

If this kind of study is lamented charge of selective reading, the other side of the fence is sitting on volcano endangering the very existence of this nation. This kind of distortions must be allayed with intellectual scrutiny without pre-conceived notion or predilections constructed by imported fairy tales of nationalism and whatever beset it. Let an instance be cited—that is periodisation of Indian history into Hindu India, Mogul India and British India. It is sheer betrayal of academic bankruptcy. History is to be studied in reference to the people, advancement of culture and civilisation. But historians like Radha Kumud Mukherjee, R.C. Mazumdar and K.M. Panikar who tried to project history in genuine nationalistic track were marginalised. Panikar's appraisal may be quoted here as a matter of reference. "The basic fact in respect of Indian

History is the continuity of the Hindu people since the time of their first integration. The continuity is one of the marvels of history. Excepting China and to some extent Persia, in no country has a people had so unbroken an existence, an existence which gives to their history in social, religious, political and artistic spheres a unity which is truly remarkable. In each one of these spheres Hindu life remained today a development and continuation of what it was when the Hindus were first integrated into a people."[4]

Similarly M.A. Buch maintains, "There is a clear cultural unity (of India). India is predominantly Hindu India; and the cultural oneness of Hindu India is established beyond a shadow of doubt. There is a common sacred language, the Sanskrit; a common religious literature, a common body of laws. The institution of pilgrimages was one of the most important unifying agencies throughout the ages. Thus a common consciousness was maintained even in those days of slow and ineffective communications. Great saints and scholars used to roam about the whole country, preaching a common faith, and spreading a religious atmosphere"[5] Radha Kumud Mukherjee has vividly underlined fundamental unity of India under the same title. He maintained, "Early Hindu History unmistakably shows that the political consciousness of the people had from very early times grasped the whole of India as a unit, and assimilated the entire area as the theatre of its activities."[6] Writing Foreword in the same work late Premier of England Ramsay Macdonald has presented India as the body and Hinduism as the soul.[7]

At the moment history is on trial if we would have a close look on the contemporary interpretations employed by the denationalised forces. The nation ought to be the master and not the slave of its own history.[8] The aberration may be ascribed to political compulsion, intellectual complacency owing to debased academic corridor, and the like. Let certain dimensions of some representative

builders of recent-day India be studied in order to present the vexed complexion of modern Indian ideas conforming the ethos set by the parallel paradigm with a view to discharging solemn intellectual responsibility.

Notes and References

1. Ravinder Kumar, Ed., A Centenary History of the Indian National Congress, Vol. II., Preface, p. xxvi.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Morris-Jones, "The Languages of Indian Politics: An Appraisal" in *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, Ed., Iqbal Narain, p. 54.
4. Panikar, K.M., The Determining Periods of Indian History, p. 3. The publisher's note further reads, "Taking an extensive sweep of three hundred-year periods, 350 to 250 B.C., 1330 A.D. to 1430 A.D. and 1818 to 1918 A.D., Panikar narrates the story . . . He points out that in the first of these periods was wrought the integration of the Indian people through Sanskrit language and literature, that the resistance to Islam in the second resulted in Hindu religious renaissance, and that the influence of an alien civilisation and of the English language in the third transformed our ancient society into a vigorous and forward-looking nation".
5. Buch, M.A., Rise and Growth of Militant Nationalism in India, p. 14.
6. Mukherjee, Radha Kumud, Fundamental Unity of India, p. 116.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
8. Savarkar, V.D., The Indian War of Independence, Intr., p. i.

1

MAHATMA GANDHI

While going through the post-renaissance epoch of modern India the name of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) is visibly the most radiant. As actor and thinker his area of activity and thinking cannot be regimented in term of academic discipline. Therefore, while varying interpretations are being sought in order to construct his thought or determine his sphere of influence it is imperative to touch certain vital aspects to suit the objective of the present discourse.

From his very adolescence, being influenced by his mother, Gandhi developed keenness for Hindu scriptures and traditions of Vaishnavite cult. Recitation of 'Rama nama' in his childhood, Gandhi writes in his autobiography, cured his fear of ghosts. He regarded the Ramayana of Tulsidas as the greatest book of all devotional literature.[1] He also studied the Vedas and Upanishads as he "should do as a Hindu" and he claims "to have grasped their true spirit."[2] There was also tremendous influence of Bhagwat Gita on him.[3] It blessed him ample spiritual strength.

Mahatma Gandhi was no doubt greatly swayed by the Bible, the Sermons on the Mount, Koran, Life of Mohammad, and the great classics of the West, but it

was Hindu philosophy which constituted the bed-rock of his thought-structure. He never hesitated to own the indissoluble bond which bound him to Hinduism. "She (Hinduism) is like my wife and moves me as no other woman in the world can" was his final summing up. In spite of his leanings to other systems, in short, his obvious choice was the Hindu method.[4] He loved it "dearer than life itself."[5] Dr. Rajendra Prasad comments, "Our ancient cultural heritage facilitated Gandhiji in his mission."[6] In the words of C.F. Andrews, "The more we study Mahatma Gandhi's life and the teachings the more certain it becomes that the Hindu religion has been the greatest of all influences in shaping his ideas and actions."[7] Gandhiji himself concedes, "There was a time when I was wavering between Hinduism and Christianity. When I recovered my balance of mind, I felt that to me salvation was possible only through the Hindu religion and my faith in Hinduism grew deeper and more enlightened."[8]

Gandhi's concept of religion is unlike the Semitic perception. His idea of religion is higher and nobler than understood in common parlance. To him, religion is spiritualism, a version of 'Dharma'. In his words, "The term religion I am using in its best sense, meaning thereby self-realisation or knowledge of self".[9] It entails both metaphysics and ethics. Therefore, to him, politics bereft of religion is a death trap because it kills the soul.[10] Hence, it leads Jay Prakash Narayan to comment that "philosophically Gandhism has a non-secular and religious or supernatural foundation.[11] This was crystally appeared in Gandhi's agenda of anti-colonial struggle. In Hind Swaraj Gandhi wrote, "Passive resistance seeks to rejoin politics and religion,"[12] and that too in the perspective Hindu tradition.[13] Mohammad Ali Jinnah, therefore, hastened to believe that Gandhi gave the Congress a Hindu outlook and Hindu ideals.[14]

However, while not accepting the orthodox versions of 'Dharma' on many vital matters, Gandhi adhered to the broad traditions of Hindu thought.[15] The true religious

attitude to him meant the voluntary acceptance and anthuasiatic fulfilment of the duties that naturally came one's way—'Swadharma'.[16] W.N. Brown observes, as a religious pious genius Gandhi's basic objectives were morally oriented[17] and he never made compromise to it. Further, he stretched his ethical religion to the extent which was made up of laws knitting all men the world over.[18] His religion was 'Manav Dharma' (Human Religion) supplanting all narrow barriers erected by caste and creed. It was based on humanistic ethos and spiritual quest.

Lest, while appreciating all schools of thought, as usually displayed by the Hindu thinkers, Gandhi reposed trust on Hindu ideals. In his words, "... though I admire much in Christianity. . . find solace in Bhagvad Gita and Upanishads that I miss even in the Sermons on the Mount."[19] His study on different religions confirmed in his own faith Hinduism.[20] He tried to unify the teachings of Gita. To him, the Gita became an infallible guide of conduct. In his language, "Just as I turned to the English dictionary for the meaning of English words, I turned to this dictionary of conduct (Gita) for a ready solution of all my troubles and trials. Words like 'aparigraha' (non-possession) and 'sama bhava' (equability) gripped me, which stood for a change of heart, a change of attitude."[21] He also plunged deep into 'Raja Yoga' and Patanjali's 'Yoga Sutras'. Beside those, he was swayed by Mimansa, Sampra and Vaishnava scriptures.[22] His first African years were full of religious searchings, and one of the central questions was his relation to Hinduism—whether he was a Hindu, and in what way he could be Hindu. Theosophy helped him to settle this question.[23] He also on many occasions appreciated the great role played by Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj. Gandhi had great reverence for Bal Gangadhar Tilak,[24] Vivekananda, Sister Nivedita[25] and Annie Besant[26] for their lofty ideals and pioneering roles. Romain Rolland noticed in him traits similar to Vivekananda.[27]

As a Hindu Gandhi was sternest of Hindu.[28] He extolled Hinduism intellectually and emotionally.[29] For all practical purposes he demonstrated himself as a thorough Hindu.[30] His following declaration in *Young India* goes a long way in the direction, which reads: "I am a Sanatani Hindu because

1. I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures and therefore, in 'avataras' and 'rebirth'.
2. I believe in the 'Varnashrama Dharma' in a sense, in my opinion, strictly Vedic, but not in its present popular and crude sense.
3. I believe in the protection of cow in its much larger sense than the popular.
4. I do not disbelieve in idol worship.[31]

Gandhi held firm view that pure Hinduism contained everything one might expect from a religion. He discerned the special beauty of Hinduism in the fact that it includes all the essentials of other religions and what excludes he considered inessential.[32] Therefore, he added that Hinduism is the most glorious religion. He further stated, "I have endeavoured in the light of a prayerful-study of other faiths in the light of my own experiences in trying to live the teachings of Hinduism, to give an extended meaning to Hinduism as a living faith."[33] He preached Hinduism as a religion of service.[34] He extolled, "Hindu Dharma is like a boundless ocean teeming with priceless gems. The deeper you dive, the more treasure you find."[35] To him, Hinduism is like a dynamic, open, universal, creative and evolving religion which ever enriches itself by assimilation.[36] Gandhi is a true incarnation of Hindu spirituality and in the direct line of descent from the ancient sages, has re-interpreted its truths and applying them in a marvellously original manner to the conditions of the modern man. Therefore, he is regarded as a great prophet of Hinduism.[37] He deserves to be remembered as

the greatest saviour of popular Hinduism, "a title nobody would dispute."[38]

However, the question at stake is something more. Gandhi was a staunch Hindu—does it justify by itself his Hindu nationalist credential? This can be explained in two-fold manners—implicitly and explicitly. In the way he explained Hinduism, its scriptures, legends, culture and the like go beyond the horizon of recorded history and strikes the root of Indian nationalism. He forcefully subscribes to the Hindu foundation of Indian nation. In his words, "Hinduism is a growth of ages. The very name, Hinduism, was given to the religion of the people of Hindusthan by foreigners.[39] To him, 'Sanatna Dharma' is the vital faith handed down from generations belonging even to the pre-historic period and based upon the Vedas and writings followed them. For him, the Vedas are as indefinable as God and Hinduism, and he takes supreme pride in giving cognisance of himself as a Hindu.[40] This kind of expression leads one to measure his inclination to Indian history and its root in relation to Hinduism. The same yard-stick may be applied to other great savants as well—that Hinduism itself is the expression of Indian nationalism since time immemorial, and thus Hinduism and Indian nation do move together on parallel lines. Hinduism is not only the 'parent religion', as Annie Besant coined, but it is the covert expression of the Indian life philosophy itself.

To recall Gandhi's understanding further—he believed that the concept 'Hindu' itself was originally a geographical concept, meaning those who inhabited the environs of the source of the Sindhu (Indus) river.[41] "The very Hindu is modern", he exhorted. "The name of our religion is 'Manav Dharma', i.e., man's religion. Manusmriti is the code of man's religion." "The fountain of all is the Vedas. . . Before the advent of British rule in India, the Hindu society was undergoing change from time to time. British rule changed all this. What was fit for change became petrified. If there was a change, it

came either from the Privy Council or the British made legislation. Owing to this, much harm has been done, and society has become inert like the super-imposed laws".[42] This reminds Tilak's opposition to the Age of Consent Bill, and other Hindu nationalists' world view on social reform.

Gandhi's stand on Ambedkar's decision to desert Hinduism is quote-worthy in the present context. He said, "Religion is not like a house or a cloak which can be changed at will. It is more an integral part of one's self than of one's body. Religion is the tie that binds one to one's Creator and whilst the body perishes, as it has to religion persists even after death. If Dr. Ambedkar has faith in God, I would urge to assuage his wrath and reconsider the position and examine his ancestral religion on its merits and not through the weakness of its faithless followers."[43]

One author subscribes the view that Gandhi was revivalist of Hinduism in its original form.[44] Gandhi contribution to the regeneration of Hinduism was monumental.[45] In fact, he followed the footsteps of Tilak in Hindu rejuvenation.[46] He maintained its continuity picking up what Tilak had left by organising "Hindu Prachar, Harijan Seva, and advocating cow protection, and giving Hindu names to his movement like Ram Raj and Swaraj."[47] These symbols and idioms unleashed electrifying impact on Indian masses. His movement was inextricably interwoven with the popular Hinduism that one fails to distinguish where one ended and the other began. Even regarding his chosen contrivance of non-violence Gandhi wrote, "My life is dedicated to the service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism."[48]

One of Gandhiji's observation in *Young India* may be reproduced here—"Hinduism has become a conservative religion and therefore a mighty force, because of the swadeshi spirit underlying it. It is the most tolerant

because it is non-prosylitising, and it is as capable of expansion today as it has been found to be in the past. It has been succeeded, not in driving out as I think it has been erroneously held, but in absorbing Buddhism. By reason of the Swadeshi spirit, a Hindu refuses to change his religion, not necessarily because he considers it to be the best, but because he knows that he can complement it by introducing reforms. And what I have said about Hinduism is, I suppose, true to other great faith of the world, only it is held that it is specially so in the case of Hinduism."[49]

Like the classical Hindu nationalists, Gandhi believed that India is not a new nation, but an ancient one; and he expressed ecstatic pride in it. His thinking was reflected by Vinoba Bhave—one of his prime disciples, thus: "We have to understand that our country is not a child; it is an old country with our experience of 10,000 years. . . India is the best country in the world for the only reason that here there is the ancient spiritual lore."[50] "For me (Gandhi) Sanatana Dharma is the vital faith handed down from generations belonging even to the prehistoric period and based upon the Vedas and the writings following them."[51] The Hindu has an age-old civilisation. His civilisation has passed through the experiences that the two recent ones (Muslims and Christians) are still passing through."[52]

Gandhi is one of the greatest reformers of Hindu society in modern times. In his words, "I am a reformer through and through. But my zeal never leads me to the rejection of any of the essential things of Hinduism". His heart was burning for two calumnies of Hindu society. One was the practice of untouchability and the other was the cow slaughter. He sought to remove untouchability in order to strengthen the society. His methodology was inclusive, humanistic. "For reform of Hinduism and for its real protection, removal of untouchability is the greatest thing."[53] In his version, "Two of the strongest desires that keep me in flesh and

bone are the emancipation of the untouchables and the protection of the cow. When these two desires are fulfilled there is Swaraj and there lies my own Moksha. May God give you strength to work out your salvation."[54]

Regarding cow slaughter Gandhi wrote, "That which distinguishes Hinduism from every other religion is its 'cow protection'. . . She is mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God. The ancient seer whoever he was, began in India with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is all the more forcible because it is speechless. . . Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow. Hindus are enjoined to protect the cow by self-purification, by self-sacrifice."[55] "Cow. . . protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in all human evolution; for it takes the human being beyond his speeches. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives. . . Cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world."[56]

Further, in relation to language (which is a great ingredient of nationalism) Gandhi held the perception that 'Hindu' education would be inadequate without knowledge of rudiments of Sanskrit."[57]

Gandhi's concept of the state derives its strength from the idea of 'Dharma' drawn from Indian sources.[58] He saw 'Dharma' in the image of Truth, in line with the ancient Hindu sages. So he believed that the basis of the state must be 'Dharma'.[59]

Gandhian concept of Sarvoday is an ideal of life—a grand construction encompassing all isms and virtues. It is ever ready to receive and absorb everything that is good in other ideologies.[60] In the best Indian tradition it assimilates the positive factors the world has bequeathed. He borrowed the word Sarvoday from a Jain scripture by Acharya Samantabhadra who lived about two thousand

years ago. It is India's indigenous innovation in the realm of thought sprouting out of religion. Gandhi sought to translate it into Savoday ideal.[61] The concept of Sarvoday is not prisoner of any dogma, and covers every gamut of individual and corporate life. Gandhi firmly believed in the fundamental unity of life, and rejected the distinction between public and private, secular and sacred. In fact, Indian political thought was not affected by anything like the church-state dichotomy of the West.[62] His "path was 'karma yoga', or spiritualisation through social action, that is associated with classical heroes like Rama and Janaka and has been re-affirmed in modern India by Vivekanada and Aurobindo."[63] His insistence was on Dharma performed by the citizens[64]—that is duty-oriented. All these features, viz., all-comprehensive life, insistence on Dharma, linking up the past with the present, organic view of the society, and the like do find striking resemblance with the concept of Integral Humanism, the culmination of thought, assiduously articulated by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay in later period.[65]

* * * * * * *

Gandhi's deep-rooted attachment to Hinduism is latent in term of its influence on him as well as his commitment to it. Nonetheless he was profoundly catholic toward other religious denominations. This is in fact a tenet of Hinduism as Toynbee commented in relation to Ramakrishna. Gandhi was convinced that Hinduism emerged stronger and richer with the historical interactions with the alien religions like Islam and Christianity.[66] Thus, he was cautious of Hinduism as of Indian origin[67] distinguishing it from the Semitic religions. So far as his catholicism was concerned he was dwelling at higher plane. In his words, "In spite of my being a staunch Hindu, I find room in my faith for Christian and Islamic and Zorastrian teaching and therefore, my Hinduism seems to some a conglomeration and some have even dubbed me as an eclectic. Well, to call a man eclectic is to say he has no faith, but mine is a broad

faith which does not oppose Christianity-not even plymouth Brother, not even the most fanatical Musalman. . . It is that broad faith which sustains me."[68] Simultaneously Gandhi was opposed to conversion particularly of the so-called untouchables. Further, he did not appreciate to divide the Hindu society under any social line. He undertook fast unto death on 20 September 1932 when Premier Ramsay Macdonald, on the demand of Dr. Ambedkar, gave Communal Award in August 1932 creating seats for the depressed classes to be filled by the election on the basis of separate electorate. His plea was that it would result in perpetuating untouchability by segregating the untouchables from the rest of the Hindu community.[69]

Gandhi equally agitated against orthodoxy within. Though a protagonist of Manusmriti he was vocal that untouchability was not a part of Hinduism.[70] He made plea that "we do not want on our register and on our census Untouchables classified as a separate class. . . It will create a division in Hinduism which I cannot possibly look forward to with any satisfaction whatsoever. . . Those who speak of the political right of Untouchables do not know their India, do not know how Indian society is today constructed, and therefore I want to say with all the emphasis that I can command that if I was born the only person to resist this thing I would resist it with my life."[71]

Gandhi reacted to the Viceroy's reference on caste Hindus in 1945 thus: "There is an expression in the Viceregal broadcast which certainly offends my ear and which I hope, will offend that of every political minded Hindu. . . Does not Veer Savarkar or Dr. Shyama Prasad or Dr. Moonje of the Hindu Mahasabha represent all the Hindus without distinction of caste? Do they not include the so-called untouchables? Do they themselves claim to be caste Hindus? I hope not of all politically minded Hindus, I know that even revered Pandit Malaviyaji, though he observes the caste distinctions, will refuse to

be called a caste Hindu, as distinguished from the other Hindus . . . I want to acquit His Excellency of knowing susceptibilities of the Hindu society or dividing it."[72] This discourse underlies two factors—that while opposing untouchability Gandhi was obstinate not to split the Hindu society, which amounts to a step forward for Hindu consolidation advocated by the Hindu nationalists.

* * * * * * *

While no room is left to cast aspersion on Hindu identity of Gandhi, his crusade to embark on Hindu-Muslim solidarity during the trying course of freedom struggle raises certain eye-brows. But it does not dilute his original position. Rather it vindicates his catholicity—an element of Hindu ethos.

Nonetheless Gandhi was familiar with the ground reality. In 1915 returning from South Africa he moved all over the country on insistence of his mentor Gopal Krishna Gokhale. After intensive tour he felt that average Hindu was a coward whereas average Muslim was a bully. This kind of assessment underscores his sensibility on the problem of Indian nationalism in term of Hindu society. He suggested, "If Hindus would not believe in themselves and work in accordance with their traditions they will have no reason to fear bullying. The moment they recommence the real spiritual training, the Muslims will respond. He can not help it, If I can get together a band of young Hindus with faith in themselves. . . the band will become a shield for the weaker ones."[73]

However, as a noble personality Mahatma Gandhi expected good sense to prevail and put emphasis on greater unity of all the elements of Indian populace. He urged them that the so-called Muslims of India were merely converted Hindus.[74] In an interview with Louis Fischer Gandhi stated, "Every Muslim will have a Hindu name if he goes back far enough in his family history. Every Muslim is merely a Hindu who has accepted

Islam."[75] To Gandhi, India is the homeland of the Indian Muslims. "For instance, take the case of my son Harilal. He had embraced Islam. By changing his religion, can he disown his nationality and country? Supposing he is able to change his nationality and country, all the same he cannot disown his father."[76] In a letter to Mohammad Ali Jinnah he thundered, "I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants, claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one before the advent of Islam it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children . . . You do not claim to be a separate nation by right of conquest but by reason of acceptance of Islam."[77] Reacting to partition he stated, "If they (the Muslims) want to partition India on that basis (of separate nationhood), they must have the partition unless Hindus want to fight against such a division."[78] These expressions are of nearest proximation to the Hindu nationalists.

Gandhi was instrumental in clubbing the Khilafat issue with the nationalist movement in Amritsar Congress of 1919 with great expectation of heralding a grand social coalition. But the result was just the reverse at the end. He suspended the non-co-operation movement in 1922 in order to uphold the cause of non-violence, which was so dear to him. The suspension had nothing to do with the Khilafat issue, rather it failed in Turkey itself which was the citadel of the movement. But the Muslims unleashed abuse to Gandhi instead of expressing gratitude to him for turning a communitarian cause like the Khilafat into the respectability of a nationalist affair. Even Maulana Mohammad Ali, an architect of the Khilafat Movement, lamented charge that it was the influence of the Hindu nationalists like Madan Mohan Malaviya which prevented Gandhi from seeing the other side.[79]

However, Gandhi could sense the alienation of the Muslims as community from the struggle for independence. He observed in 1925 thus: "This allegation is correct that Muslims are not taking interest in the

national movement, because they are not thinking India as their home, for which they should be proud. I understand that they think themselves as the descendants of the invaders."[80] Another instance of 1947 following partition and communal holocaust then is worthwhile to be recalled. While he was undertaking fast in order to restore communal harmony Maulana Hifzur Rehman and some other Muslims requested Gandhi to ask the Government of India to arrange their migration to England. Then the Maulana said he felt sorry if his words did hurt him. Gandhi retorted with instant banter: "That would you like the Englishmen who kicks you and at the same time goes on saying: "I beg your pardon!" Becoming serious, he proceeded: "Do you not feel ashamed of asking to be sent to England? And then you said that slavery under British rule was better than independence under the Union of India. How dare you claim to be patriots and nationalists, utter such words? You have to cleanse your hearts and learn to be cent per cent truthful. Otherwise India will not tolerate you for long and even I shall not be able to help you. . . Should I say make some arrangement for these unfaithful Muslims?"[81]

Nevertheless it is inept to conclude that Gandhi was a Hindu nationalist because he dubbed the Muslims at certain moment; which is in fact not the working methodology or objective of the Hindu nationalists. But it appears at certain point while referring the ground reality of history and empirical study of contemporary politics. The problem at stake is that Gandhi was averse to minoritism and the appeasement policy which cropped up simultaneously. As an elite conciliator par excellence he endeavoured his best to put the entire Indian community on one platform. One's success or failure is not the indicator of his stance. He emulated the footprints of Vivekananda-Tilak tradition under distinct atmosphere. If he failed it was the dictate of history. A people gets the fate it deserves. But the monumental success of Gandhi in this dimension is marginalised and eroded by the pseudo secular nationalists behind him.

Those who are poignant with spiritualised politics and indigenous tradition occupied the mobilising seat and monopolised to interpret the quintessence of Gandhism. If this aberration is swept away Mahatma Gandhi emerges as one of the greatest Hindu nationalists in spirit.

In the long-run an emotional aspect needs to be presented. Following Gandhiji's sad assassination the so-called secular nationalists set on head-on collision against the Hindu nationalists and directed the entire force under their disposal to mobilise public opinion against the latter that it is repugnant to the Gandhian values. Their subterfuge became successful to a considerable extent. But throughout his life Gandhi maintained hearty relation with the protagonists of Hindu nationalism in spite of certain exceptions. He did not mince word in appreciating the fundamentals of their appraisal on Indian nationalism. He expressed his mind that his sense of nationalism was multiplied after studying Vivekananda's lectures. What was the substance of Vivekananda's lectures pertaining to nationalism? Gandhi expressed his ecstatic pleasure in the court in 1924 when the was compared with Tilak by the Jury. Is it merely for his personal regard to Tilak? Gandhi had high esteem for Aurobindo beside other great savants of renaissance. He subscribed to the cult of Bande Mataram,[82] to which the secular nationalists got allergic as a matter of their appeasement package. Paying tribute to Swami Shraddhananda following his assassination, Gandhi described him as a hero among the heroes.[83] These kinds of illustrations are volumes in store on which an independent research work may be undertaken.

Addressing five hundred 'swayamsevaks' of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh at the Bhangi colony on the morning of 16 September 1947, Gandhiji said that he had visited their camp years ago (in 1934) at Wardha when the founder (Dr. Hedgewar) was alive. Gandhi had been very well impressed by their discipline, complete absence of untouchability, and rigorous simplicity. "Since then, the Sangh had grown", he testified. He was convinced that

any organisation which was inspired by the ideal of service and sacrifice was bound to grow in strength. "Prayer that was recited by the RSS (in the Bhangi colony 'shakha' that morning), was in praise of Mother India, Hindu culture and Hindu religion. The speaker claimed to be a 'sanatani' Hindu took the root meaning of the word 'sanatana'. No one knew accurately the origin of the word 'Hindu'. The name was given to us and had characteristically adopted it. Hinduism had absorbed the best of all the faiths of the world and in that sense Hinduism was not an exclusive religion". Gandhi further eulogised, the RSS "is a well-organised and well-disciplined body. Its strength could be used in the interests of India."[84] He also revealed his mind that he did not know whether there was any truth in the allegations made against the RSS.[85]

Well, "London Times" remarked, "No country other than India, and no religion other than Hinduism could have produced a Gandhi."[86] It addresses 'Hindu' and India as inextricable and Gandhi as the product of it. It can be reiterated that a thinker must be studied in entirety. Ironically, inspite of abundant study on Gandhi many aspects yet remain elusive and many distorted. He had to bear a great deal of burden under the driving force of history, and he had to harmonise the contradictory pressures emerging out of adverse currents. It must not be construed that he had to compromise with his ideals; but the historical dimensions appeared to be complicated. As a sequel Gandhi could identify himself with every sector, and the dominant operational managers seemed to sail their boat at their own. In a nutshell, Mahatma Gandhi was true representative of veritable Indian culture, Indian nation and whatever it connotes inspite of lifting much more burden with him in the greater horizon of humanity the ultimate goal of the Hindu ethos.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Gandhi, M.K., My Experiment with Truth, p. 23.
2. Jack, Homer A., Ed., The Gandhi Reader, p. 164.
3. Bharati, K.S., The Philosophy of Sarvoday, pp. 99-102 and 287-92.
4. Bose, R.N., Our Gandhian Heritage, p. 56.
5. *Young India*, 6 October 1921.
6. Rajendra Prasad, Legacy of Gandhiji, p. 122. Also, Radhakrishnan, S., stated—"The dominating force in his life has been Hinduism", Ed., Mahatma Gandhi, Intr., p. 16.
7. Andrews, C.F., Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas, p. 60.
8. *Young India*, 27 April 1921.
9. Q., n. 2, p. 14.
10. Andrews, C.F., Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story, pp. 353-54.
11. Jay Prakash Narayan, Socialism, Sarvoday and Democracy, p. 94.
12. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. 10, p. 248. Also original "Hind Swaraj" or "Indian Home Rule" of Gandhi.
13. Ruthermund, Indira, Political Thought of Modern India, p. 297.
14. Das, M.N., Ed., A History of Indian National Congress, Vol. III, Intr., p. 23. Also, Philips, C.H., and Wain Wright, M.D., Ed., The Partition of India, Intr., p. 33. In the words of Jinnah, ". . . He (Gandhi) is the one man responsible for turning the Congress into an instrument for the revival of Hinduism".
15. Wadha, Madhuri, Gandhi between Tradition and Modernism, pp. 14, 82.
16. Verma, V.P., Modern Indian Political Thought, p. 346.
17. Brown, W.N., The United States, India and Pakistan, p. 92.
18. Roy, S.K., The Political Thought of President Radhakrishnan, p. 92.
19. Tendulkar, D.G., Mahatma, Vol. 1, p. 31.
20. Pyarelal, Mahatma Gandhi—The Last Phase, pp 710-11.
21. n. 19.
22. Saxena, Kiran, Modern Indian Political Thought, p. 18.
23. Hunt, James D., "Gandhi and the Theosophists", in Patil, V.I., Ed., Studies on Gandhi, p. 167.
24. n. 1, p. 338. Gandhi paid glowing tribute to Tilak on his 64th birthday. (*Young India*, 19 July 1919). Also, Tendulkar, *op. cit.* Vol. 2, pp. 261, 263.
25. n. 1, p. 178.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 179, 338.
27. n. 2, p. 170.
28. Fischer, Louis, Ed., The Essential Gandhi, p. 362.
29. Q., n. 2, p. 172.

30. *Young India*, 31 December 1931.
31. *Ibid.*, 6 October 1921.
32. Gandhi, M.K., Hindu Dharma, pp. 4-5.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
34. Lalkarna, K.K., Mahatma Gandhi—Contribution to Hinduism, p. 86.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 86. Kiran Saxena also observes, "Gandhi holds Hinduism to be a relentless pursuit after truth", n. 22, p. 18.
36. *Harijan*, 2 June 1924.
37. Sharma, D.S., "A Great Prophet in Hinduism", in Radhakrishnan, *op. cit.*, p. 267.
38. Ambedkar, B.R., Gandhi and Gandhism, Intr., Das, Bhagwan, p. xviii. Das also views Gandhi as the greatest benefactor of Hinduism, in, Thus Spoke Ambedkar, Vol. II, p. 6. Also M.A. Buch observes, "Gandhi's claims to a reconstruction of Hindu society are second to none", in, Rise and Growth of Indian Nationalism, p. 1.
39. n. 37, pp. 340-41.
40. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 181.
41. Tahtien, Unto, The Core of Gandhi's Philosophy, p. 19.
42. Shukla, C.S., Ed., Incidents of Gandhiji's Life, pp. 213-14.
43. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. LXII, pp. 64-65.
44. n. 34, p. 69.
45. Singh, Karan, Essays on Hinduism, p. 38.
46. Sarhadi, A.S., Nationalism in India-The Problem, p. 15.
47. Karunakaran, K.P., Religious and Political Awakening, p. 85.
48. Q., Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 6. Also, Mehra, Parshottam, A Dictionary of Modern Indian History (1707-1947), p. 257. Gandhi wrote in "To the Hindus and Muslims" that Hindu is essentially non-violent, p. 131.
49. *Young India*, 21 June 1929.
50. Bhave, Vinoba, Revolutionary Sarvoday, pp. 14, 17.
51. Q., Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 180-81.
52. Gandhi, M.K., To the Hindus and Muslims, p. 131.
53. *Young India*, 6 January 1927.
54. *Ibid.*, 6 October 1921.
55. Q., n. 2, p. 167.
56. n. 7, p. 38. In "Hind Swaraj" also he wrote, "I respect cow, that is, I look upon her with affectionate reverence" (p. 50).
57. *Young India*, 13 May 1926. Also, *Harijan*, 10 September 1938.
58. n. 15, p. 80.
59. Sankhdher, M.M., Gandhi, Gandhism and Partition of India, p. 56. Also *Understanding Gandhi Today*, 1996.
60. Bhave, Vinoba, Sarvoday and Communism, p. 27.
61. n. 50, p. 36.

62. Iyer, Raghavan N., The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 41.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
65. Dealt in detail in Vol. 2 (The Bharatiya Jana Sangh) and Vol. 3 (last chapter of the "Positive Factors") of the present work.
66. n. 15, p. 15.
67. To Gandhi, Hinduism is native to India. Fischer, Louis, *op. cit.*, pp. 396-97.
68. Gandhi, M.K., My Religion, pp. 23-24.
69. Rajendra Prasad, Mahatma Gandhi and Bihar, p. 100. Also, Sarkar, Sumit, Modern India, p. 328.
70. *Young India*, 20 October 1920.
71. Ambedkar, B.R., What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables? pp. 68-69.
72. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 7, p. 7.
73. *Young India*, 19 June 1924.
74. Merrian, A.H., Gandhi *v.* Jinnah, p. 149.
75. At Sevagram Ashram on 6 June 1942. Gandhi, M.K., to The Protagonists of Pakistan, p. 52.
76. Incomplete press message, 8 August 1942, n. 52, p. 465.
77. Letter to Jinnah on 15 September 1944. Q., Appadorai, A., Documents on Political Thought in Modern India, Vol. 1, p. 527.
78. Q., Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 74.
79. Letter of Jinnah to Jawaharlal Nehru, 15 June 1924, in, Nehru, Jawaharlal, A Bunch of Old Letters, p. 37.
80. *Young India*, 2 April 1925.
81. Q., Pyarelal, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 709.
82. He used to write Bande Mataram very often. Illustratively, he wrote so at the end of a message to the Parsis from Sabharmati jail on 30 March 1922, in, Ganeshan, S., (Supplement), *Young India*, p. 1350.
83. *Young India*, 13 January 1927, *Ibid.*, p. 238.
84. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 8, p. 120. Also Fischer, Louis, The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 483.
85. Tendulkar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 8, p. 121.
86. Q., Radhakrishnan, S., Our Heritage, p. 100.

2

SUBHAS CHANDRA BOSE

The same kind of subterfuge as displayed in case of Mahatma Gandhi is being underscored by the traditional writings on Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. Simply that one has talked of communal harmony or for that matter he was risen beyond the religious regimentation he cannot be alienated from the fundamentals of Hindu nationalism. It is prejudicial to both the thinker and the concept of Hindu nationalism itself. A close look demonstrates Bose's identity on the same—that is to say what he is—his original position, the source of inspiration of his life, his thought-structure which determines his activities, manners and the like.

Subhas Chandra Bose (1897)[1] stands as a distinct school by himself during the Gandhian era[2] leaving indelible mark of his own, and therefore needs special attention in the on-going polemic.

In his childhood Bose was admitted in an English-medium school at Cuttack. From the very start he began to experience racial discrimination pursued by the school administration and mentally rebelled against it. He was disenchanted with the prevailing system, and as being proud of his own social tradition he liked to be dressed up,[3] which exhibits his self-esteem in the realm of

indigenous culture.

From his boyhood Bose was influenced by the life and works of Swami Vivekananda and Bankim Chandra, and developed a philosophical bent of mind.[4] He had considered view to regard Vivekananda as the father of modern nationalist movement.[5] He also used to make reference on Swami Dayananda[6] and Annie Besant[7] beside other great savants of Hindu renaissance. The kind of nationalism that sprouted during this epoch was of special interest to him, and he threw himself completely to turn their efforts into a successful culmination.

Bose was gripped with the Mahabharata and Kalidas's poetry.[8] Ramakrishna Paramahansa's spiritual enlightenment had also high bearing on his student mind.[9] Following his footstep Bose became determined to relieve himself of spiritual sufferings by renunciating the worldly desires and broadened his spiritual horizon by devoting himself to the fight for the well-being of mankind.[10] In the task of liberating his mind of superstitions Vivekananda was of great help to him. Bose wrote in his unfinished autobiography that for days, weeks, months he poured over the works of Vivekananda. Vivekananda's letters and his speeches from Colombo to Almora, replete as they were with practical advice to his countrymen, inspired Bose the most from the very core of heart. The religion that Vivekananda preached—including his conception of Yoga—was based on rational philosophy of Vedanta. His conception of Vedanta was founded on scientific principles. One of his missions of life was to bring about a reconciliation between science and philosophy, and this he held was possible through Vedanta.[11]

Intellectually being influenced by Hindu spiritualist philosophy Bose maintained that for the study of politics and other social sciences it was necessary to understand the absolute.[12] He made a pilgrimage to north India expecting to find a religious preceptor—but he failed in

his mission.[13] Shankara's doctrine of 'Advaita' and 'Maya' had herculean impact on him. It developed his ascetic temperament as well as broadened his outlook on life and his mission.

While Bose was in Presidency College in 1916 one British Professor of Philosophy, E.F. Oaten, was manhandled by some students for he deprecated the Indian civilisation as barbarous and misbehaved with the protesting students. Bose was suspected and expelled from the College as he refused to divulge the names of his friends who were actually behind the incident nor did he deny his association with them.[14]

Regarding Aurobindo, the fire-brand Hindu nationalist, Bose observed: "In my undergraduate days Aurobindo Ghose was the most popular leader in Bengal, despite his voluntary exile and absence since 1909. His close association with Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak had given him an All-India popularity. . . a mixture of spirituality and politics had given him a help of mysticism and made his personality more fascinating to those who were religiously inclined. . . In those days it was remoured that Aurobindo. . . would return to active life as an 'enlightened' man, like Gautama Buddha. . . to effect the political salvation of his country. . . We felt convinced that spiritual enlightenment was necessary for effective national service. . . I was impressed by his deeper philosophy . . . All that was needed in my eyes to make Aurobindo an ideal 'guru' for mankind was his return to active life."[15]

Bankim Chandra in his 'Anand Math' described the Mother as she was (Jagaddhatri), as she has been (Kali) and as she would be (Durga).[16] Similarly, Bose spelt of India's glorious past, India's miserable present and India's bright future.[17] He had high appreciation that Indians had created the image of the Mother with all that was best in their being; and their national struggle began with the perennial song 'Vande Mataram'.[18] He perceived

Mother India in Goddess Durga and Kali. Mystically he interpreted that in the tradition of Indian nationalism the term nation is identified with Kali.[19] He wrote to Bivabati in 1926: ". . . In Durga we see Mother, Motherland and the Universe all in one. She is at once Mother, Motherland and the Universal Spirit. . ."[20] In his letter to Basanti Devi Bose stated that whenever they were in crises they had invoked the Mother. "Indians had created the image of the Mother", he continued, "with all that was best in their being."[21]

Netaji described himself as an Indian Pilgrim as evident from the title of his autobiography. His whole life was one pilgrimage to discover 'Mother India' without any selfish yearning. This is the Hindu philosophy of Karma and Bhakti. This inclination of Netaji finds a world of resemblance with Bankim Chandra's philosophy. It was the philosophy of perfect and unconditional Bhakti, unstinted ever by selfish desire, which inspired all thoughts and actions of Bose. Neither the Indian Civil Service nor the Congress Presidentship nor the lure of a comfortable life in an Indian prison with the assurance of loaves and fishes of office after the struggle could deviate him from his mission.[22]

To Bose, devotion to the divine Providence also meant intense attachment to one's country, i.e., patriotism. Thus, political activity or service to the country was at the same time religious action. Political workers were 'karma yogis' striving for the liberation of their country as well as for personal salvation or 'moksha'. This was a lesson that Bose learnt from religious texts like Bhagvat Gita and from his nationalist forbears, particularly Bankim Chandra and Aurobindo.[23]

Bose identified Indian nationhood with its traditional phenomenons such as languages, festivals, signias and the like. Illustratively he called Prof. Stanislaw F. Mischalshi of Poland, a great scholar in Sanskrit and Indian culture as a worshipper of Mother India.[24] In 1925,

in an article entitled, "The Call of the Motherland" Bose appealed to all to come forward, to put on Rakhi, the symbol of brotherhood, and be initiated in the temple of the mother with the vow that they would put an end to the shame that afflicted the mother, re-establish India again on the high pedestal of freedom and recover the lost glory of the Mother India.[25] Rakhi Day and Durga Puja were meticulously being celebrated in Indian National Army. In many letters Bose started with writing at the top "Mother Durga be with us". It is on record that he christened the Provisional Government of India on 21st October 1943 synchronising the day of Vijaya Dashami. One of the service men of Indian National Army testified that Bose used to begin his day at early morning chanting 'Chandi path' with great meditation.[26] Bhagvat Gita was Bose's constant companion and he always carried a small copy of it in the breast-pocket of his field uniform.[27] He had also made reference on Saraswati Puja.[28] He used to quote Ramayana and Mahabharata to justify his strategy against the British in order to establish 'Dharma Rajya'.[29]

Bose was in favour of the much celebrated song "Bande Mataram" as the national song, which inspired the entire panaroma of the national struggle and which was the music at its backdrop prompting heart-beating of millions. He suggested Jawaharlal Nehru to read the book 'Anand Math' if there was any wrong in it. Further, he popularised the slogan 'Jay Hind' and was instrumental in placing the Ashoka wheel in the national flag. All these reactions and emotions remind one the course of the great Swadeshi movement of 1905-07 which was in effect the climax of Hindu nationalism during the phase of renaissance.

Bose had high appreciation for India's past and was proud of it. He underscored the underlying continuity of Indian nationhood cropping up since at least 3000 B.C., if not earlier, embedded with the lustre of its veritable culture and civilisation.[30] He also spoke aloud on the great achievements of the past in different strata of life.[31]

In his Presidential Address of the All India Youth Congress, 1928, Bose expressed, "We must take our stand on our past. India has a culture of her own which she must continue to develop along with her distinct channels."[32] In his Tokyo University speech in November 1944 Bose submitted that if a nation does not find its continuity there is no hope of it. He added, "We want a modern India based of course, on the past. . . We want to build up a new and modern nation on the basis of our old culture and civilisation."[33] He maintained that like an individual a nation has also birth, decay and death. But if it has vitality it can withstand that test of history since soul is eternal. The Indian nation died more than once, he continued, but every time it had its resurrection because there was justification for its existence. India has a message to the world, he held. In his words, "The human body may go down to dust, but the soul never dies. It is just the same with a nation too. Although a nation may die her soul lives on in the shape of her civilisation, culture and tradition. When a nation loses its creative genius it becomes certain that the nation is going to die. . . India has passed through many such death and subsequent revivals because she has a mission of her own and that mission is yet to be fulfilled."[34] "Only those among India's sons and daughters are really alive who have a firm faith in that mission of India."[35] There is no iota of doubt what he means by the culture and civilisation of past of India, and India's soul and mission—its continuity and vitality.

As a serious student of history Bose felt that a national awakening in India in most cases was heralded by a religious reformation and a cultural renaissance.[36] In a letter to his mother Bose mentioned: "Mother, it is not only the country that is in pitiable condition! How holy and eternal the Hindu religion was and how degraded our religion is now! Think of the Aryans who hallowed this earth by their presence and look at their fallen descendants! Is that holy eternal faith going to be extinct? Look how atheism, lack of faith and biogotry have become

rampant—leading to so much sin and so much misery for the people. Look how the descendants of the deeply religious Aryans have now become irreligious and atheistic! . . . Will not any son of Mother India in distress, in total disregard of selfish interests, dedicate his whole life to the cause of the Mother? . . . Our religion is suffering the pangs of near death—does that not stir our hearts? . . . How many selfless sons of the Mother are prepared, in this selfish age, to completely give up their personal interests and take the plunge for the Mother? . . . so many mothers have lived for the sake of Mother India and have, when the need arose, sacrificed their lives for her. Think of Ahalya Bai, Meera Bai, Durga Bai—there are so many. . ."[37]

In another letter to Hemanta Kumar Sarkar, Bose regretted that "pure Aryan blood no longer flows in our veins. Slavery of ages—so much of adulteration. . . The Hindu race no longer has that pristine freshenss—that youthful vigour and these unmatched human qualities . . . ."[38] That is why he suggested, in a letter to Bivabati Bose, thus: ". . . Please get all the children to read Kashi Ramdas's 'Mahabharata' and Krittibas's 'Ramayana'...."[39] This kind of Aryan race spirit, Mother-image construction, and bridging up Hinduism and India very well run in the line of Hindu nationalism. It is further enriched by eulogisation to the past and the mission to revive it.

In Lahore Students' Conference Bose addressed, "India has something original to contribute to the culture and civilisation of the world in almost every department of human life."[40] "Our emphasis was not on civilisation but on culture; not in the material side of life but on intellectual and spiritual. . . Owing to our superior thought power, we could hold our own against invaders from outside even when we were vanquished physically for the time being. . . while the ancient Egyptians went down before the Arab invaders and disappeared altogether."[41] Bose put emphasis on nation, national culture and national psychology while pointing out the lapses of

communism.[42] "If we start running after material wealth we shall be selling our birth right for a mess of pottage. . . The new India will be created by Bengal's (virtually India's) genius through a revival of her literature, science, art and music. . . The Bengalis alone are capable of bringing about a cultural synthesis and effecting comprehensive development of our national life. . . It will be the duty of Bengali men and women to revive the lost glory of India."[43] Bose tried to inspire the mass of his region—the spirit of sub-nationalism directed towards greater nationalism without prejudicial to any narrow creed. He again stated, "There is something in India's culture which is essential for the fullest development of human civilisation. . . The sages of India kept the lights of learning burning through ages and ages of darkness. As their descendants, how can we lie before we have fulfilled that higher purpose of our race?"[44]

Bose never accepted the theory of multi-national nationality of India and disagreed with the view that Indian unity was a gift of British suzerainty over India. According to him, Indian nationalism is neither the product of geographical condition nor of Britain's imperial politics like evolution of state nationalism of the West. "Her nationalism is basically cultural and spiritual concept. It developed as emotional idea or a sacred feeling through various process of synthesis and harmony in the long history of her organic growth."[45] He believed that there is nonetheless a fundamental unity underlying this diversity, and that fundamental is essentially concerned with culture, language, tradition, legend, point of honour and so on. He then quotes Vincent Smith's famous aphorism to vindicate his explanation.[46] This is perfect instance of cultural nationalism, in turn, Hindu nationalism.

In 1933 Bose wrote a letter to Dilip Roy that he was a Shaiva as well as a Shakta and Vaishnava; and elaborated its signification in term of religion.[47] In the then Bengal three religious streams were prevalent, viz.,

Tantra, Vaishnavism and Navanayana and Raghunandan's Smriti. On the side of Nyaya and Smriti, Bengal has a close kinship with Aryavarta, through Vaishnavism she maintains a life line with the South, while through the Tantra she has a relationship with the races living in the Tibetan, Burmese and Himalayan regions.[48] Similarly, he chained up Indian nationalism with universalism in term of mysticism. In his words, "Indian nationalism. . . is inspired by the highest ideals of the human race, viz., 'satyam' (the true), 'shivam' (the good), and 'sundaram' (the beautiful).[49] This kind of unifying tendency is a unique feature of Hindu nationalism.

Though a supporter of socialist ideology, Bose was not an orthodox Marxist-which was because of his deep-rooted faith in the spiritualist philosophy.[50] He reacted, "New ideas of socialism are now-a-days travelling to India from the West and they are revolutionising the thoughts of many, but the idea of socialism is not novelty in this country. We regard it as such because we have lost the thread of our own history."[51] Recalling the fiery words of Swami Vivekananda he exhorted: "Let a new India emerge through the workshop and from the huts and bazars." "This socialism did not derive its birth from the books of Karl Marx", he reiterated, "It has its own origin in the thought and culture of India."[52] He maintained that only through further developing its own genius could Indian culture make a distinct contribution to the world culture. He did not like to close the doors of India. But while accepting the ideas from abroad it must undergo indigenous scrutiny. Illustratively, materialist interpretation of life and class-struggle have no place in Indian way of life and evolution. That is why Bose was sceptic of the success of communism and socialism in India if they were deficient of Indian values. Rather his world-view was inclusive and sought to turn India into a laboratory of varying experiments. But he was cautious that Indian ethos were not compromised by that. In order to allay any kind of apprehension he used the nomenclature 'Samyavadi Dal' for his proposed socialist

forum which really evoked Indian concept.[53]

Bal Gangadhar Tilak made visit to England in the year 1919 in connection with defamation suit against Valentine Chirol before the Privy Council, and in this tour he availed the opportunity to address the Indian students in Cambridge. He suggested the promising students not to join the imperial service. This was a matter of strong confabulation among the students there,[54] and Bose translated the suggestion into practice. He resigned from the much coveted Indian Civil Service in 1921 and sailed back to India. He accepted Deshabandhu Chittaranjan Das as his political mentor. Das was a staunch nationalist, a critic of western model of nationalism, and an exponent of universalistic nationalism of Indian variant. His concept of nationalism bears the features of cultural nationalism.[55] In his words, "I find in the conception of my country the expression also of divinity."[56] His evocation of oneness of Indian nationalism perfectly suits the stand of the Hindu nationalism. In his words, "We cannot forget that the different nationalities of India, although there are differences between them.... Yet spiritually and historically they are bound up as so many links in the chain of one living national individuality."[57] Thus, impact of both Tilak and Das on Bose is of great value in the direction.

Sacrifice was the key-note in the life of Bose, and he laid supreme sacrifice at the alter of the motherland. His letter to the Bengal Government from the central jail in 1940 on the eve of his fast unto death is memorable with its thrilling tone.[58] Illustrations are numerous. Yet a few words may be mentioned. In the stream of Bankim's *Anand Math* he observed, ". . . Our motherland again wants a band of young Sanyasis or selfless workers. Friends, if you are really to sacrifice yourself, do please come forward. Our mother can offer you nothing but sufferings and privations, starvation and imprisonment. If you like the god of Nilakantha (Shiva) you can unflinchingly face all sufferings and privations, do come

forward then. The mother needs you all. God willing, if you survive to the end, you will be able to enjoy the free air of Independent India. If, on the other hand, you have to lay down your lives in the service of your motherland, the Kingdom of Heaven will be opened unto you. Come forward then, if you are really the heroic sons of the motherland."[59] This is absolutely in tune with Lord Krishna's advice to Arjuna in the battle of Mahabharata. Further, putting the nation at the zenith is in consonance with Indian heritage.

Asking the people to uphold their inherent culture, Bose recalls Sri Krishna saying in Gita, "it is better to die for one's convictions". He learnt that whatever is foreign to one's nature is always a source of danger. If the people go against the native genius of the race, he felt, they would be guilty of committing suicide.[60]

Finally, Bose's thought-structure conforms the fundamentals of Hindu ethos, which may be summed up as Integral Humanism. He observes, "A nation's life, like that of a man, requires a harmonious development in all its spheres and when a new spirit invigorates the body-politic of a nation its growth is a quick as it is sure."[61] His organic and idealist concept of nation tinged with mysticism, historical continuity of past, present and future, harmonious life-edifice in both the individual and national life, latent genius of the nation with its soul with a determined bid to convey distinct message to the world, synthesis of religion and nationalism—all taken together do constitute the basic features of Integral Humanism. No definite conceptual system on this has been built up so far; but there is ample scope to articulate so.

Bose stood at par with the Hindu nationalists so much so that he believed in cultural nationalism as against territorial nationalism, evoked India's glorious past, subscribed to spiritualist philosophy as against materialism, proud of Hindu ethos, discerned Mother cult

of nationalism, got influenced by Bankim Chandra, Vivekananda and Aurobindo, believed in distinct Indian nationhood and above all probed Hinduism as the indigenous way of life sprouting at the earliest phase of Indian history and as such representative of Indian nationhood. He was secular in the sense that he accepted all the people of India in his scheme of national reconstruction. This idea finds imprint in the wholistic Hindu nationalism. His vision of secularism, socialism, universalism and modernism are not beyond the greater horizon of Hindutva. His ideas cannot be analysed leaving aside his philosophical outlook and the influences he received. Well, as mentioned earlier, he sought Hindu Muslim fraternity, criticised certain agenda of Hindu Mahasabha and all that. The traditional authors on Bose's social and political thought would cite large number of quotations to substantiate this assertion. But the substratum of Bose's thought can hardly be undermined to suit one's theorisation.

It is evident that Bose was struck by the fact that believers in Christianity and Islam had built empires and converted large numbers of that faith. So he advised a plan for spreading Hinduism to Africa as one part of making India a great nation.[62] Leonard Gordon summarises that Bose's notion of Hinduism was an essential part of his Indianness.[63] Therefore, he comments that "Bose adhered to the concept of territorial nationalism has no foundation". Rather his aspersion that the Indian land had specifically Hindu connotation as in Bankim Chandra's 'Anand Math' is true.[64]

Under this backdrop the present author would like to quote an extract of a letter of Bose which spells volumes on the characteristic features of Hindu nationalism in entirety—it is self-explanatory. This is a letter to his mother written as early as 1912-13, which reads: "India is God's beloved land. He has been in this great land in every age in the form of the saviour for the enlightenment of the people, to rid this earth of sin and to establish

righteousness and truth in every Indian heart. He has come into being in many countries in human form, but not so many times in any other country—that is why I say, India, our motherland, is God's beloved land. . . In the Deccan I see the Godavari, with her pure and sacred waters reaching upto its banks, wending its way eternally to sea, a holy river indeed! To see her or think of her at . . . resounding all the while with the voice of the great sage, chanting mantra from the Holy Vedas—Every little thing in the Ramayana is so noble. . . alas, unable to appreciate this nobility. . . We have lost our religion, and everything else even our national life. We are now a weak, servile, irreligious and cursed nation. . . O' Lord. . . where is the eternal religion that your chosen men established here? The religion and the nation that our forbears the Aryans built up and established are now in ruins. . . What happened to our hoary past? Where are those Aryan heroes who would freely sacrifice their precious lives in the service of Mother India? . . . How holy and eternal the Hindu religion was and how degraded our religion is now! Think of the Aryans who hallowed the earth by their presence and look at us their fallen descendants? . . . Shall we continue to turn a deaf ear to the wailings of our nation? Our ancient religion is suffering the pangs of near death—does that not stir our hearts? How long can one sit with folded arms and watch this state of our country and religion?. . . "[65]

* * * * * * *

A booklet titled "Netaji—Hindutva and RSS" was released on 23 January 1997 in Delhi. It has highlighted Subhas Chandra Bose's espousal of Hindutva as the identity and as the basis of the unity and immortality of our nation. While travelling by train to attend the Tripuri session of Indian National Congress in 1939 he came across through the window a root march of RSS 'swayamsevaks' at Nagpur and was enamoured of it. He admired Dr. Hedgewar and his work.[66] He intended to have a meeting with him in July 1939, and finally he had

been to Dr. Hedgewar's residence on 20 June 1940; but failed to avail him because of his worsening health.[67]

Notes and References

1. It was reported that Bose died in a plane crash in Taiwan on 18 August 1945. However, certain influential section of Indians (e.g., Prof. Samar Mukherjee and Dr. Shishir Kumar Bose) do believe that Netaji is still alive.
2. But it must not be construed that he was a product of Gandhian movement. He had marked differences from Gandhi on approach to the national struggle as well as national reconstruction.
3. Bose, S.C., An Indian Pilgrim, p. 15.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.
5. Bose, S.C., The Indian Struggle, p. 30.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
8. n. 3, p. 31.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.
10. Hayashida, T., Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, p. 7.
11. n. 3, pp. 32-33.
12. Bose, S.C., "My Personal Testament", Oracle, January, 1979, p. 2.
13. n. 3, pp. 60-62.
14. Oaten, E.F., in his speech at Patna on 21 January 1981 mentioned that "the young idealist Subhas" did not beat him. Moreover, he clarified that he never denigrated Indian civilisation. It was a mere misunderstanding, he reported. (*The Statesman*, 23 January 1981, Calcutta).
15. n. 3, pp. 53-56.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
17. Chakraborty, S.K., "Political Ideas of Subhas Chandra Bose", paper presented, Netaji Research Bureau, Calcutta, 23 January 1979.
18. Bose, S.C., Correspondence (1924-32), 30 July 1927.
19. Bose, S.C., "Selected Speeches", pp. 110-11.
20. n. 18, p. 116.
21. Basanti Devi, the wife of C.R. Das, was regarded by Bose as mother, n. 18, 20 July 1927.
22. Pattanaik, D.D., Political Philosophy of Subhas Chandra Bose, p. 83.
23. Gordon, Leonard, Brothers Against the Raj, p. 123.

24. Bright, J.S., Important Speeches and Writings of Subhas Bose, p. 174.
25. n. 18, December 1925.
26. The Samaj, 23 January 1997, Cuttack.
27. Mazumdar, S.K., The Warrior Prophet of India, p. 13.
28. n. 18, p. 322.
29. Chattopadhyay, S.C., Subhas Chandra Bose: Man, Mission and Means, p. 75.
30. n. 5, p. 11.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-18.
32. Netaji Speaks: A Collection of Speeches and Writings, Vol. One, p. 5.
33. Bose, S.C., Fundamental Questions of Indian Revolution, p. 10.
34. Bose, S.C., The Mission of Life, p. 10 (September 1926).
35. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
36. n. 31, p. 13.
37. n. 3, p. 125. Letter from Ranchi. No date.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
39. n. 18, date not mentioned.
40. n. 24, p. 94.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 214.
42. n. 32, p. 14.
43. n. 34, pp. 5-6.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
45. Q., Gordon, Leonard, Bengal: The Nationalist Movement, p. 238.
46. n. 5, p. 10.
47. n. 23, p. 263. Letter from Europe.
48. Letter to Sarat Chattopadhyay from Mandalay Jail on 12.8.25. in, n. 34, pp. 114-15.
49. *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, 3 May 1938, Q., 23, p. 116.
50. Verma, B.P., Paper read and published, Netaji Research Bureau, Calcutta, 1973.
51. Q., Raghavan, G.N.S., The Making of Modern India, p. 108.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Historic Netaji Document. Letter to Kunti, date not mentioned. Also, signed editorial in Forward Bloc, 12 August 1939.
54. Bose, S.K., and Bose, S., Ed., The Essential Writings of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, p. 31.
55. Appadorai, A., Documents on Political Thought in Modern India, Vol. IV, pp. 715-17.
56. Speech at Mymensingh on 11 October 1917, "C.R. Speeches", p. 203.
57. Q., Tagore, R.N., Nationalism, p. 55.

58. Bose, S.C., Crossroads, p. 380.
59. n. 34., pp. 7-8.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
62. Guha, Samar, Netaji: The Revolutionary, pp. 557-58.
63. n. 23, p. 263.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
65. n. 54, pp. 19-22.
66. Muslim India, May 1997, p. 226.
67. Devendra Swaroop, "Subhas aur Hedgewar Ki Bhavbhoomi", Panchajanya, 28 January, 1996, p. 24.

3

RAJENDRA PRASAD

Under the ostensible strong current of cultural nationalism in the Congress umbrella the name of Dr. Rajendra Prasad (1884-1963) receives high acclamation. In this galaxy represented by Sardar Patel, Rajgopalachari, M.R. Jaykar, K.M., Munshi beside others Rajendra Prasad was a prominent fellow-traveller. Well, they were not ideological system builders or theoreticians at common parlance. They were destined to undertake the historic responsibility of anti-colonial struggle. But in the course of the struggle they could successfully erect a kind of nationalism which reflected the heart and soul of the earlier Congress Nationalists (Extremists). The advent of Gandhian era witnessed eclipse of both the Moderate and the Extremist schools; but both the elements were conspicuously made available compounded under the extenuating circumstance. However, the nationalist sector experienced more complications in the changed circumstance particularly when minority appeasement had made deep in roads. Following the pyrrhic success of the non-co-operation movement Muslim communalism gained ground, and as a matter of reaction to it the Hindu Mahasabha came into vogue. But the stature and style of Gandhiji was phenomenally unparalleled. There was no way out to the front ranking Congress men. They clung to the Congress under the

astute leadership of Mahatma Gandhi but without alienating from the fundamentals of cultural nationalist base they were possessed of. But the irony is that the Hindu Mahasabha and the like were labelled as the classical breed of Hindu nationalists which had then earned pejorative stamp of Hindu communalism. In this sea-change the emerging Congressmen with cultural nationalist backdrop had historic responsibility to discharge. They were basically not different from the classical school so much so that their source of inspiration were the same—that is the thought-structure of Dayananda-Bankim-Vivekananda stream. They were fed with the intellectual diet of the hoary past of India with sublime cultural heritage and ethos. In the operational stage of politics their strategy were different, but which hardly marginalised their thinking. Rajendra Prasad is exactly a prominent product of this non-conventional school of Hindu nationalism, and he deserves special attention as a principal career of this stream and mover of history in mid-twentieth century.

Like Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad's mother Kamaleswari Devi provided him the elixir of morales during his childhood with the instrumentality of the stories of Ramayana[1] and other great scriptures. He developed the same kind of religious temperament all through his life. During his stay in Rashtrapati Bhavan (1950-1962) as President he used to spend his leisure time in listening to devotional songs and reading Tulsi Das's Ramcharit Manas. He was also fascinated with discourse on religion.[2] Though it is repetation it can again be clarified since it is of imperative necessity that one's religious inclination does not *suo motto* justify his inclination to Hindu nationalism. But the analysis is also the same—that insistence on Hinduism amounts to Indianness in the long-run and compounded together they give rise to the concept of Hindu nationalism.

Further it is argued that Rajendra Prasad was a great spokesman of Hindu-Muslim unity. But this

catholicity does not cancel his Hinduness rather strengthens the wider vision of the latter. It is apparent from the massive work of Rajendra Prasad, that is 'India Divided' where he assiduously submits a graphic picture of Muslim communitarian complexion, its origin and growth leaning on historical reality; but simultaneously lighting focus on Hindu identity of Indian nation in reference to its age-old culture, tradition and civilisation. Thus, he had well founded basis to embark on Hindu-Muslim consolidation. There is no paradox of Hinduness and the factor of communal harmony.

Rajendra Prasad had hand in globe relationship with the Hindu Mahasabhaites, namely Lala Lajpat Rai, Madan Mohan Malaviya and others. The Hindu Mahasabha first assembled at Gaya in the year 1922. Rajendra Prasad wrote on the event like this: "As the Congress session was to be shortly held at Gaya, some Hindus thought of having a session of the Hindu Sabha there, and decided to ask Pandit Malaviya to preside over it. Pandit Malaviya agreed to accept the presidentship on condition that I, too, should join the Sabha and extend an invitation to him to accept that office. I agreed because I saw nothing wrong about it. Later when differences arose between the Hindu Sabha and the Congress, Malaviyaji reminded me that he had agreed to become President of the Gaya Sabha at my request. The Gaya session of the Hindu Sabha itself was successfully held, and the principal decision taken was that the Hindus should be organised."[3] The tone and tenor of this evidence spells the inkiling of Prasad. From the beginning of matured stage of his public life he had strong conviction on Hindu consolidation as a matter of national service.

Rajendra Prasad glorified Hinduism in the context of Indian nationalism. He recalled, for instance, that the base of Hindu and Muslim music was obviously Hindu.[4] He further reminds that every Hindu who performs his 'sandhya' has to repeat a 'sloka' in the 'sankalpa' in which he picturises the country as a whole and imagines

the waters of the Sindhu, the Ganga, and the Cavery to be mingled together in the water of his small water pot. And this has been found even if there had been different kingdoms all over the country.[5] This analysis underlies the concept of culture-based nationalism as against territorial nationalism—the kernel of Hindu nationalist thought.

Dr. Prasad further proceeds to espouse national integration and that too in the spirit of Hindutva. In his words, "There are four places of pilgrimages which are known as the four 'Dharmas', a visit to which is said to earn the greatest virtue for a Hindu. They are Rameswaram in the southern tip of the Peninsula, Badrikashrama deep in the Himalayas at a height of some 15,000 feet, Jagannath Puri on the east coast of Orissa, and Dwarka on the western sea-coast in Kathiawar. It cannot be denied that irrespective of who ruled and what were the administrative or political divisions of the country, the Hindus have never conceived of India as comprising anything less than what we regard as India today. The Muslim and British rulers have simply accepted the traditional delimitation of the country."[6] Thus, he made whole-hearted appraisal to establish a bridge between Hindu religious tradition and national integration in unflinching terms. He also felt that Durga Puja is a truly national festival.[7] This kind of constant expressions unfold the elusive ideas of a person, and in case of Prasad the revelation is more expressive if the context is grasped in toto.

Rajendra Prasad presents an inspiring note on ancient India and glorifies it to the heart's content. To him, from the oldest times the word Nation is applied to the inhabitants of one country, though they differ in some peculiarities which are characteristically of their own.[8] But in spite of it, he probes, a deep underlying unity of Indian nation which hinges transparently on Hinduism. This is substantiated by his analysis on culture, the term which is heavily distorted by the other

side of the fence. He envisions, "Culture is essentially an expression of the inner urges and cumulative beliefs of a community or nation gathered through centuries of experience. . . It is the perennial flow of the cultural stream which determines a nation's strength, its character in the wider sense and its capacity to survive."[9] Only Hinduism withstands this test—which is overt and covert expression of the land and the people of India.

Rajendra Prasad further mentions: "The myths and legends of the snow-clad Himalayan regions in the north are made of the same stuff as the legends of far-off Kerala in the south. To a large extent, I believe, it is the two great Indian epics, the Ramayana and Mahabharata, which provided common links in the realm of thought, literature and social customs of the various regions. It cannot be said to be purely accidental that literary activity in nearly all the Indian languages, particularly the languages of the north, east and the west, which were then in a formative stage began with local translations of the two epics or parts thereof. Even in the case of the Dravidian languages, the classical tradition began only with the popularisation of the Mahabharata and the Ramayana through local media. It is significant fact that in all our languages the first fruits of literary effort were either translations of these epics or independent works based on the themes of the epics."[10] In this manner he meticulously discovered the soul of India even in the area of literature drawing a straight line between Hindu epics and the oneness of Indian nation.

Regarding Sanskrit Prasad observes, it "is the langauge of India's culture and inspiration, the language in which all her past greatness, her rich thought and her spiritual aspirations are enshrined. . . it has been the principal vehicle of our nation's cultural traditions. . . Sanskrit has indeed played a great part in the cultural evolution of the country."[11] He has contributed a volume entitled "Sanskrit ka adhyayan" (The Study of Sanskrit) in Hindi. This love for Sanskrit adds a feather in the direction.

Rajendra Prasad suggested that national integration could be promoted through devotional songs.[12] It is a matter of conjecture what kind of devotional songs he had in mind in order to buttress the cause of national integration. In different context he made exposition as to how this aspect has contributed to India's national genius. In his words, "Who does not know that the Rama and Krishna Bhakti movements led by the saints played a great part in the development of Hindi and that these bhakti movements spread from the south to the north? It was Sri Ramanuja and later Swami Ramananda, a disciple of his line, who brought the Rama bhakti movement to Kashi. It was owing to their inspiration that the bhakti movement came to be propagated in the regional languages, beside Sanskrit. . . Braja bhasa owes much to Vallabhacharya and his followers who inundated Mathura with the Krishna bhakti cult. The Krishna bhakti movement has influenced deeply the Bengali language also. . ."[13] Evoking national integration he extolled the great service rendered by the south of India thus: " . . . It is not only Shankaracharya you have given us, the people of the north, but also Ramanujacharya, Ramananda and Vallabhacharya; and it is the teachings and the lives of saints like those which have kept us together all these centuries."[14] Thus, north-south dichotomy was out and out spurned by him in term religio-reform movements within the Hindu society, and also in term of national solidarity.

Rajendra Prasad senses that in Indian culture there has been a spirit of tolerance and mutual reconciliation which has imparted stability, vitality, and continuity to the Indian civilisation.[15] He clarifies the case of Buddhism *vis-a-vis* Hinduism in this context. In his language, "It cannot be conceded that Hinduism destroyed Buddhism by force. One refutable argument against any such contention is that Hindu religion has not only demonstrated its tolerance of other religions but has really accorded Buddhism a pride of place in its tenets. The Hindus have accepted the Buddha as one of the

incarnations of God. It is apparent, therefore, that the Buddhist faith could not have been destroyed by force in India. Many of the fundamental principles of Buddhism were to a very great extent derived from the ancient accepted fundamental principles of Hinduism. The Hindus accepted whatever was new or novel in the principles of Buddhism and also adopted much change in the way of life and conduct of the individual which Buddhism brought about. In the course of time, the difference between Hinduism and Buddhism . . . (eroded) and ultimately Hinduism alone remained."[16] On some other occasion he mentioned thus: ". . . I have been saying that Hinduism has adopted the fundamentals of Buddhism so that Buddha's teachings has become a part and parcel of Hindu Shastra and Hindu life."[17]

As a catholic Hindu, as one would be, Rajendra Prasad was certainly in favour of communal harmony. But this principle was greatly misconceived and misfired as a plank of appeasement. He was critical of the provision of separate electorate, which was the stepping stone for providing special safeguard containing the seeds of fissiparous tendencies. He was not in the corridor of political rostrum when the provision of separate electorate was incorporated in 1909 and gained legitimacy in 1916, but he took serious exception to it later.[18] He rather sought social assimilation in order to usher into communal cohesion. He recalls "Sir Syed ke Akhri Mozamine" where Syed Ahmed is given to mention: "Just as the Aryan people are called Hindus, even so are also Musalman Hindus, that is to say, inhabitants of Hindusthan."[19]

All over his works "India Divided" and "At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi" Rajendra Prasad makes sincere attempt to explore the age-old culture and tradition of India, paid honour to it and sought its continuity in order to build up a glorious India. He joined certain key issues raised by the Hindu Mahasabha—illustratively, cow protection, on which he devotes a complete chapter in his pioneering work "At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi."[20]

Rajendra Prasad was absolved from the narrow area of secularism defined by the perverted secularists. His angle can be inferred from one of his versions, which reads: "Raja Chiranjit Singh of Kapurthala interviewed me this afternoon and expressed concern that in our secular state religion is being neglected and ignored. He feels that without the background of religion our people are apt to lose all moral values. The old system of imparting religious ideas if not instruction in the homes and villages is gradually disappearing so far as the Hindus are concerned. India is not the only secular state in the world. For all practical purposes England is also one, but England maintains a church and in all educational institutions has an important place. Among religious communities there is some system of imparting religious ideas and practices but not so among the Hindus."

"He (Chiranjit Singh) is very anxious that something should be done. In some respects his views are shared by many people. But in India ever since the advent of Islam religion has never occupied the position it does in other countries, but Hinduism has not ceased to flourish. The people have kept it alive and its own inherent strength has helped it to survive many difficulties under which other faiths might have succumbed."[21]

Rajendra Prasad was squarely dubbed by the so-called secularists in reference to his actions and reactions on delicate issues. But he was a relentless upholder of Hindu customs and values. Eyebrows were raised when he touched the feet of a priest at Kashi Vishvanath temple while being the President of Indian Republic. The socialists and the communists particularly, thundered as how the Head of the State committed to secularism could lay before a priest. But was he not a Hindu because he became the President? Rather he felt it desirable to demonstrate reverence for the cultural tradition in the capacity of the President.

In 1950 Prasad incurred displeasure of Jawaharlal

Nehru on his resolve to inaugurate the installation of new deity in the reconstructed temple of Somnath (which was the seat of pillage of Mohammad of Ghazni as early as 1001 A.D.). Nerhu tried to convince him that his (Prasad's) visit to the temple for a religious ceremony would be improper as he was the head of a secular state. But the reason was much more. It involved the Muslim sentiment. Rajendra Prasad silenced Nehru with his usual eloquence: "As a Hindu I cannot disown my religion for being the President."[22]

Among his colleagues in politics, Sardar Patel was closest to Rajendra Prasad. They had much in common[23] particularly on the vexed areas of religion, culture and nationalism. In December 1950 Patel passed away, and Prasad joined his funeral ceremony much to the chagrin of Pandit Nehru.[24] The latter's plea was that it might create a wrong precedent if the President attended the funeral ceremony of a Cabinet Minister. But it involved the question of personal equation, emotion and much more from either side.

Rajendra Prasad was disenchanted with the Hindu Code Bill, 1951. His objection was on two counts. "First, that it should be legislated by the newly elected Parliament since the existing was mere a provisional one specifically intended to enact the Constitution. Secondly, since it was supposed that interference with personal law that governs members of a community following a particular religion meant no interference with the freedom of conscience, there is no reason why the same civil law relating to marriage, marital relations, inheritance etc., should not govern members of all communities and why uniform code for all should not be sought to be enacted and why the personal law of a particular community should be selected for legislative interference. If, on the other hand, it is intended to benefit the whole community, then it is obvious that the opinion of that community should be obtained and that has not been done in this case. . . The Hindu Law gives the greatest latitude for

changes to be introduced. It recognises custom as one of the primary sources of law. . . and it has been advancing . . . "[25] Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee corroborated this stand and challenged if they dare codify the Islamic Personal Law. It also reminds Tilak's stand, beside other Nationalists, against legislation of Hindu Personal Laws lest it might pave the way for erosion of customary laws. Their plea was to leave the same to its natural course while creating strong public opinion against the prejudices and ignominies.

It has become a matter of secular extravaganza to indict everything communal if the matter is akin to Hindu interest and to be over-cautious and scared of minority sentiment. Consequently most of the communal problems in term of intensity is manufactured in ivory towers. Let a letter of Dr. Prasad be mentioned in order to contemplate his concern of Hindu interest at a given circumstance. He wrote to Vallabh Bhai Patel on 5 September 1947 thus: "Last night a mob of Meos, some 500 or so, came out in Karolbagh and demonstrated in the streets. Subsequently the military party arrived and they dispersed. The situation, however, is extremely explosive and the non-Muslims in that area who are in minority, are very apprehensive of an attack. . . I understand that a large number of police officers in-charge of various police stations are Muslims. They are said to be from 70 to 80 in number. The Hindus are naturally apprehensive that they may not get protection from them when the trouble starts. Shops dealing in arms are also owned by Muslims and I am told there are at least three such shops. This has to be taken into consideration. There is a demand on the part of the Hindus of the city as distinguished from refugees that they (the Hindus of the city) should be provided with arms for self-defence against immigrants like the Meos. I am passing this on for your consideration. Whatever has to be done should be done without delay so that trouble may not start."[26] The crux of the point is his frankness to a problem. Can one political leader venture to express so without inviting

wrath from the worshippers of the goddess of secularism?

It is a matter of interest how Rajendra Prasad might have managed as the President with Pandit Nehru as the Prime Minister since both had diametrically opposed world-view. The latter was agnostic, westernised in education and culture while the former was inclined to metaphysical ideals embedded to eternal religion. This was the backdrop of their differences curiously ensuing President Prime Minister dichotomy of unprecedented dimension giving rise to legalistic and constitutional schools on the role and position of the President. Further, owing to this backdrop Nehru was reluctant to send Prasad abroad lest apprehension might crop up in foreign lands on secular credential of India. Any way, Prasad's ascendancy to the august offices in Indian National Congress, the Constituent Assembly, and above all the Indian Republic did not deter him to represent the Nationalist cause as Tilak and Malaviya did during their days. The so-called secular brand emerging in post-independence India did not knit him in a fix. He was assertive, dynamic, and occupied key position by virtue of his merit rather than manoeuvring; which he utilised thoroughly as a matter of disinterested task for the Nation providing a boost to the cause of Hindu nationalism in his typical manner.

Notes and References

1. Mehra, Parshottam, A Dictionary of Modern Indian History, p. 559.
2. Chaudhuri, Valmiki, Ed., Dr. Rajendra Prasad: Correspondence and Select Documents, Vol. 6, Dr. Radhakrishnan's observation on the overleaf.
3. Rajendra Prasad, At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 137.
4. Rajendra Prasad, India Divided, p. 59.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
7. Portrait of a President, p. 178. Prasad mentioned in a letter to Mrs. Gyanvati on 11 October 1959.

8. n. 4, p. 79.
9. Handa, R.L., Rajendra Prasad: Twelve Years of Triumph and Despair, p. 198.
10. Inaugural Address at the Malayalam Art Festival, Delhi, 9 December 1954. Derived from "The Unity of India (Selected Speeches of Dr. Rajendra Prasad), p. 25.
11. Presidential Address at the annual session of the Sanskrit Vishva Parishad, 11 November 1953, *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.
12. n. 7, p. 182 (10 April 1960).
13. Address to Hyderabad Hindu Prachar Sabha, 3 August 1960, n. 10, p. 66.
14. Address at Citizens' meeting, Coimbatore, 10 August 1960, *Ibid.*, p. 68.
15. Verma, V.P., Modern Indian Political Thought, p. 59.
16. n. 3, p. 166.
17. n. 7, p. 170 (28 March 1959).
18. n. 4, (mentioning Aga Khan's delegation to Lord Minto in 1906 at Shimla and the note of Lady Minto thereon).
19. *Ibid.*
20. n. 3, Ch. 27, pp. 249-59.
21. n. 7, p. 113 (18 January 1959).
22. Kunzru, H.N., The Prime Minister's President, p. 20.
23. n. 1, p. 561.
24. Sikri, S.L., Indian Government and Politics, p. 111. Nehru also asked Dr. S. Radhakrishnan not to attend the funeral ceremony of Dr. Rajendra Prasad at Patna in 1963 on the plea that there were some scheduled programmes. Dr. Radhakrishnan did not oblige; rather asked Nehru to cancel his programme and join him.
25. Note from Rajendra Prasad to Pandit Nehru, 14 September 1959, n. 9, pp. 217-19.
26. Das, Durga, Ed., Sardar Patel's Correspondence, 1945-50, Vol. IV. Letter from New Delhi, 5 September 1947.

    N.B.: Rajendra Babu announced in the Constituent Assembly that 'Vande Mataram' would have equal status with the national song. (Vol. 3).

4

VALLABH BHAI PATEL

The same kind of historical perspective, political breeding, professional career and the like of Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel (1875-1950) may be ascribed as those of Dr. Rajendra Prasad. Hence both of them may be clubbed under the same school of political and nationalist thinking.

Sardar Patel was often vocal and straight forward on vexed Hindu-Muslim questions pertaining to nationalism. His blunt replies occasioned by sensitive moments often put his colleagues, opponents and strangers at fix. But he was not merely emotive but well-composed, and this fetched for him the spontaneous appallation "The Iron Man of India"—often considered to have earned more credibility than Bismarck. So far as the current discourse is concerned Patel obviously emerges as a Hindu nationalist—may be a ridiculous expression for the contemporary secularists, but a genuine one to comprehend his genius *vis-a-vis* identity in right perspective. He was obviously in Gandhian camp—for which he was proud of, but his location is much more and different in term of nationalist ideological perception.

Like Mahatma Gandhi, Patel was born and brought

up in a traditional Hindu family of Gujarat—rural and peasantry based. His mother Ladbai used to disseminate Vallabh Bhai the epics of Ramayana and Mahabharata which instilled in him herculean moral strength.[1] During his first imprisonment Patel asked for three books to read, viz., Bhagvat Gita, Tulsi Ramayana and Ashrama Bhajanabali, the book of hymns of Gandhi's Ashram. The great epics infused in Patel's mind warrior-like qualities, and awakened in him a restless spirit and an irresistible desire to fight against injustice—first at school and later on the political stage of India.[2]

Sardar Patel was equally close to Mahatma Gandhi as Nehru and Prasad were, and earned stature of national leadership. If he would have made his debut two decades earlier he would have been in the camp of the Congress Nationalists (Extremists) since he was possessed of the common attributes and think-tank as them. But history does not move in a straight line—it is occasioned by fluctuations, and the activist of the given situation is to pick up the current of the time. Sardar Patel had to accept the challenges of the time both within and without. Though he was environed by the persons poignant to his psychology he never minced words on the vital questions of his considered perception.

To recall certain instances—during the satyagraha of Borsad in 1922 certain kind of crime increased there. Public men in Gujarat learnt about the pact between the Police and a Muslim docoit. Vallabh Bhai challenged the Government on the matter.[3] The issue is of little importance; but the point at stake is to raise a question irrespective of its communal bias. Similarly, regarding the Khilafat imbroglio he would privately state that when the Indians were slave it was curious that they would want to fight for the Turkish Khalifa.[4] Consequently Muslim Leaguers like Khalid-uz Zaman made frontal attack on him.[5] In spite of this type of offensive he did not maintain double standard.

Patel disapproved Ambedkar's proposal for mass conversion of members of the Scheduled Castes to other religion.[6] He was proud of as a Hindu, and had reverence for its sublime culture and tradition. He had also full sense of its adherence to Indian nationalism. Precisely speaking, he had considered conviction of India's Hindu foundation.

At this level Sardar Patel had to fight double battle. Possessing and nurturing of Hindu ideals was not enough—though many of his colleagues were shy of it—but he had also to deal against Muslim minoritism eating into the vitals of Indianness. He was well aware of the developments following the Lucknow Congress (1916) and Amritsar Congress (1919). This follow-up was the direct offshoot of eroded secularist bias displayed by the Congress elites of the time responsible for mass mobilisation. Patel accepted the genuine secular version of Indian tradition which incorporates religion as a humanising force for promotion of tolerance, compassion, non-violence and accommodation. He was, for that matter, disenchanted with dilution of national ethos by surrendering to the Muslim minority and giving it a prominence and status in political affairs inconsistent with that accorded to other communities. National interest to him was the guiding principle supplanting the casteist and communitarian aspirations.

Presiding over the Karachi session of Indian National Congress in 1931 Sardar Patel expressed: "As a Hindu, I adopt my predecessor's formula and present the minorities with a Swadeshi fountain pen and paper and let them write out their demands. And I should endorse them. I know that it is the quickest method. But it requires courage on the part of the Hindu. What we want is a heart of unity, not a patched up paper-unity that will break under the slightest strain. That unity can only come when the majority takes courage in both the hands and is prepared to change places with minority."[7] He was a great critic of the provision of the separate electorate

and the in-built concept of special safeguard of the minorities growing up as a policy of spurious appeasement.[8] It amounted to, as events proved, placing a veto in the hands of the minority.[9] Minority interest can hardly be safeguarded at the cost of the majority and the national interest.

Patel took serious exception to the then Congress President Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's formula in August 1945 seeking parity of Hindus with Muslims in the Interim Government.[10] During the trying year of 1946 Patel was very concerned with the injured Hindu sentiment.[11] He stood as a rock against the obnoxious demand of partition, which resulted out of the unprincipled policies pursued within and without. He damned Mohammad Ali Jinnah: "It is a monstrous thing that a man can claim a different nationality because he changed his religion."[12] However, the partition became 'fait accompli'. Patel retorted, "If a minority could divide India is it a minority?"[13] As Home Minister he had particularly to deal with the trivial circumstance of communal flare up during the partition days. But he had hard not to crack under the Prime Ministership of Jawaharlal Nehru, the presiding architect of 'secular India'—the kind of which was beyond the comprehension of the former. It was more delicate when the nation was bleeding profusely compromising the very root of India's nationhood.

In a mammoth gathering of the Muslim community in the sensitive area of Bada Imam of Lucknow in December 1947 some speakers ventured to revive the demand of special safeguards. The Sardar, who was star attraction there, unequivocally spurned it mentioning that the demand was next to impossible. Rather he sarcastically aired : "Those who want to go Pakistan can go there and live in peace. Let us live here in peace to work for ourselves."[14] This address at the momentum epoch drew serious attention from all concerned; but that is the unique mannerism of the Sardar. He made this stand transparent in the Constituent Assembly.

Moving consideration of report of Advisory Committee on Minorities, he uttered, "Minority concessions, though not good in themselves, have to be treated as purely temporary". He exhorted that "the minorities should voluntarily agree to abolition of reservations for them in services and legislatures."[15] Simultaneously he warned Pakistan against pushing Hindus out of eastern wing.[16] Further he asked the Indian Muslims in 1948 thus: "In the recent All-India Muslim Conference, why did you not open your mouths on the Kashmir issue? Why did you not condemn the action of Pakistan? These things create doubts in the minds of the people."[17]

But for the uncompromising crusade of Sardar Patel the State of Hyderabad could not have been made to accede to India on the same aspersion of Muslim sentiment as happened in case of Kashmir and a fresh problem might have erupted. If he could have been given a free hand relating to Kashmir things could have taken a different turn. He emphatically affirmed, "Let there be no mistake that Kashmir belongs to India."[18]

On the eve of independence within the power structure of the Congress the Hindu nationalist bloc looked for leadership more to Patel. This sector pinned faith on the ancient Hindu traditions and were averse to the western ideals. Unlike the liberal and the Marxist factions they had considered perception on Indian nationalism. They were profusely pained with the partition and the aftermath thereof. Judging from the content of his Lucknow speech, B.D. Graham observes, Patel was assuming that the Hindu nationalist wing of the party would be strengthened to the point where some connection with the Hindu Mahasabha and the RSS would be possible.[19]

Sardar Patel was unambiguously clear in his agenda inspite of express and tacit reservation of his critics. It was entirely due to his inspiration and suggestion that the minorities with one voice gave up their claims to

reservation of seats. If he came into conflict with his contemporaries on matters involving communal issues, it was either because they were sympathetic to minorities at the expense of the vital interests of the majority or because they closed their minds to the faults of the minority while they had their eyes and ears open to the shortcomings and pitfalls of the majority community.[20] Patel also believed that the interests of the minorities could not be pushed to a point where they gravely prejudiced the interests of the majority community or of the country. He refused to concede that it was necessary to be non-Hindu and pro-Muslim in order to earn the title of secularist.[21]

Sardar Patel shared the sentiments of millions of Hindu compatriots. He always believed in the regeneration and re-organisation of the Hindu society which had been reduced to a decadent debris at the moment. He realised the hard reality that the Hindus as a community were sluggish, submissive, conciliatory and that they being the large majority of the population in the country their overall backwardness, lack of organisation and discipline and their comparative inability to defend themselves against the miscreants of other communities was a blot in their character. His concept was of "discipline, organisation and defensive preparations in the event of aggression on the part of other communities by the Muslim or others." He felt that if they were well organised and disciplined they would cease to constitute an invitation to aggression and as such blunt the sharp edge of militancy of other communities. Moreover, disciplinarian and dedicated to national resurgence and reconstruction as he was, he was sure that neither the community nor the country could be progressive in narrow outlook. All movements of healthy reform and constructive activity among the Hindus extracted no less approbation from him.[22] As between the different communities constituting Indian nationalism, territorially speaking, he believed that the Hindu community with its preponderance needed no less attention than others. To

the extent, therefore, that the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, which has been made the receiving end by the secularists, fitted into his concept and consequently earned his sympathy and applause.[23]

Under this backdrop it is imperative to make a reference of RSS in relation to Sardar Patel. Jawaharlal Nehru, as the Prime Minister, used to admonish RSS very often in contemptuous term as evident from his series of letters written to Sardar Patel during 1947-48. In one of his letters dated 30 December 1947 he (Nehru) expressed apprehension on RSS that it was creating trouble in Jammu and Kashmir. Patel's reply dispelled it, which reads: "Neither Bakshi (Gulam Mohammad) nor anybody in Jammu and Kashmir informed me about the RSS activities there. Whatever may have been done by the RSS in the beginning there seemed to be no evidence of their activities now."[24]

Another letter may be referred here—that is from Sardar Patel to Pandit Nehru on 8 January 1948, which reads: "Before I left on tour for Assam, you wrote to me about a complaint from Bakshi Gulam Mohammad that the Home Guards were not getting fire arms sent by us, and that the latter were being directed to the RSS. I have had now enquiries made of Mahajan. . . Neither His Highness nor the Military Advisor of the State was told about the supply of these arms, and they had no information as to who got and distributed them. . . Some RSS men joined the militia which was raised by the State, but they were under military discipline. . . The (Relief) Committee consists of the Chief Emergency Officer, Jammu (Chairman), Colonel Baldev Singh Pathania, Lala Dina Nath Mahajan (a member of the Rajya Sabha), and another member who is a local resident of the RSS."[25]

V. Shankar, Private Secretary to Sardar Patel during the stormy years of 1946-50, has contributed two massive volumes on Patel, where he has enlightened the RSS factor threadbare. His analysis verily reflects Patel's

thinking on RSS. Shankar observes, "RSS has attractive programme for the organisation and uplift of Hindu society. Unfortunately it came under suspicion (in 1947-48) for activities calculated to promote communal violence . . . It is a disciplined organisation patterned after the structure of Police with drills etc. rather than on military lines."[26] "In regard to the past of the RSS in the pre-Partition and post-Partition killings, I doubt whether there has been any clear-cut evidence of its active participation in these killings; certainly there has been no evidence of such participation as a body. In the face of this situation, Sardar Patel could not convince himself that there was a case for banning the RSS, though he was under great pressure to do so."[27] He (Patel) quipped, "By 'danda' (force) you cannot suppress any organisation. Moreover, 'danda' is meant for thieves and docoits. They (RSS people) love their country . . . They are to be won over by Congressmen with love."[28] However, the ban was imposed, and the RSS activists launched nation-wide 'satyagraha', in which tens and thousands of activists courted arrest. It drew sympathetic attention of Sardar Patel. He was amazed to come across the kind of organisational strength demonstrated by the RSS, which Congress could not build up over the decades. It also provided him a satisfaction that such a Hindu organisation had come up then.[29] In spite of apprehension and strong reservation expressed by Pandit Nehru, Patel pleaded for lifting of ban on RSS. He (Patel) used to examine the day-to-day development of the investigation and felt convinced that the RSS was not involved in the sad incident of 30 January (1948).[30] Rather he appealed the RSS members to join the Congress, and advised them to concentrate on regeneration of the Hindu society.[31] The ban was lifted in 1949; and the then RSS chief late M.S. Golwalkar expressed deep gratitude to that "great man" but for whom the tragedy of the organisation would not have been so easily healed.[32]

Sardar Patel's framework of mind gets reflection from his sympathetic attitude towards the Hindu Mahasabha as well. The Hindu lobby in the Congress

used to steal the show of the Mahasabha. However, Patel did not like to strike any electoral adjustment with the Mahasabha since its organisational edifice was feeble. But he never ridiculed them, and rather sought their co-operation. On the occasion of opening a library at Mehrauli in New Delhi on 29 December 1947, he stated, ". . . I appeal to Hindu Mahasabhaites to join the Congress. . . If you think that you are the only custodians of Hinduism, you are mistaken. Hinduism preaches a broader outlook of life. . . Those who are disloyal will have to go to Pakistan. Those who are still riding two horses will have to quit Hindusthan."[33]

Sardar Patel was instrumental in rebuilding the desecrated Somnath temple in Junagad and re-instating the deity there on 11 May 1950. He appealed for public contribution for the cause.[34] It is not merely a temple issue, but it involves the potential factor of India's national identity. Patel's venture symbolised the revival of the lost glory and wiping out thousand years of slavery and humiliation. Inkling of his mind could be read from chaste reaction of K.M. Munshi, a towering contemporary of Patel. After visiting the Somnath temple in 1937 he wrote: "My heart was full of veneration and shame. . . I left (there) with (a feeling of) bitter humiliation. . . I saw its ghastly destruction and I visualised its construction." On the occasion of its reconstruction he wrote: "An ancient race subconsciously felt that it was Somnath which connected it with the past and the present: It was the eternal symbol of its faith in itself and its future. As often as the shrine was destroyed, the urge to restore it sprang up more vividly in the heart. . . That is why for a thousand years of Mahmud's destruction of the shrine has been burnt into the collective sub-concious of the race as an unforgettable national disaster."[35] Barbarous invasion and nature of Somnath invasion has been graphically presented by Dr. Titus in "In Indian Islam".[36]

Under this backdrop Sardar Patel sought to set right a wrong committed in history and roll the ball for

national awakening. Thus, to him, obtaining liberation from two-centuries of British colonial regime was not enough. He travelled back to history and chained up political invasions of India with that of cultural pillages in the entire panaroma of history. This was the sum-total of the urge of Hindu renaissance. Golwalkar made a considered appraisal of this episode thus: "Sardar Patel rightly thought that if the Hindus were to be inspired once more to rise as a nation that was possible only if their points of honour and national self-respect were restored. It was with that thought he undertook to reconstruct the fallen seat and centre of worship of Hindus—the Somnath. That is the correct way of reconstruction of the nation. . . inspire it worth a spirit of national pride and glory."[37]

Many a occasional confabulation, letter and gesture of Sardar Patel with others may be cited in order to substantiate his Hindu nationalistic thinking. A simple writing may be referred in this context, if not more. The Raja of Aundh complemented Patel thus: " . . . the whole of the country is proud of you, especially the Hindus for whom you are the one person to protect their interests". Then he besought him to urge the Bombay government for cow protection which is integrally related with Indian culture. The Sardar replied, "I fully realise the sentiments of people in regard to the protection of cow."[38] Similarly, in another letter to Nihchaldas C. Vazirani he wrote, "... I am delighted to have your reassuring message about the position of Hindus in Sindh. . ."[39]

Sardar Patel stood as colossus to defend the nationalist cause. But he negatively burdened himself the monumental task of checkmating the adverse, debased and eroded trend of secularism. He envisioned that the slogan-mongering populism was mustering ahead to occupy the centre-stage of Indian national life; and it was exclusive, though onerous, task to insulate the chaff from the grain. He worked within the larger edifice of the Congress party, which was a commonwealth or

confederation of varied and divergent shades of opinion. But he was conscious of his goal perfectly. He felt that a visionless freedom would be disastrous, as Aurobindo Ghose had written in *Indu Prakash* in 1893 that "blind leads the blind" (in reference to the Moderates). In spite of heavy odds Patel had to work out his strategy. He was not merely a politician in the fray of electoral politics, but a man of wisdom and statesmanship. He worked under the supreme leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. While Gandhi was destined to articulate the nationalist struggle over the foundation of humanistic ethics and lofty ideals, Patel had to contribute as a blatant pragmatist.

A point must be clarified right at this stage. That, Patel stands as a Hindu nationalist not because he expressed certain strong words to the Muslim community or because he sympathised with the RSS. But it must be discerned in historical perspective that he played a vital role to augment the spirit of Hindu renaissance. His opposition to the provision of separate electorate and minority card was just. His denigration to Muslim communalism on the eve of partition was consistent; and his estimate on RSS at the same time was relevant. Let it be judged by the tribunal of impartial history. Moreover, his Somnath experiment reminds the countrymen the great wavelength of the nation re-affirming national reconstruction on the basis of idealistic cultural nationalism.

Basically Patel's framework of thought conforms the esoteric test of Hindu nationalism in entirety. But one difficulty in summing up his thought is lack of adequate first hand writings. Even no correspondence of him was preserved till his daughter Maniben Patel functioned as his Secretary in 1929. In spite of this deficiency certain references were made available in the present context though distortion and suppression of facts have become the guiding factors of the contemporary secular intellectuals and authors in the area. It seems as if Patel is to fight against this kind of perversion even after his

demise! Well, but for him, India would have been a dismembered beleaguered nation on the face of the "Un-Indian Un-national Congress" (to use the sarcastic expression of Aurobindo) and the Hindu nationalist forces would have received severest jolt of the century. Finally, his actions were not merely aimed at harnessing administrative expediency, but were deep-rooted exposures of Hindu foundation of Indian nationalism.

Notes and References

1. Chopra, P.N., The Man who Made History, "The Statesman Review", 30 May 1997. Also Mehra, Parshottam, A Dictionary of Modern India, p. 455; who observes, "Patel had a staunch Hindu background".
2. Ahluwalia, B.K., Sardar Patel: A Life, p. 8.
3. Sitaramaya, P., The History of Indian National Congress, pp. 1412-13.
4. Jayashree, S., The Iron Man of India, p. 35.
5. n. 2, p. 449.
6. Das, Durga, Ed., Sardar Patel's Correspondence, 1945-50, Vol. I, p. xxix.
7. Q., Verma, V.P., Modern Indian Political Thought, p. 361.
8. n. 2, p. 448.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 445.
10. Lemaye, Madhu, Prime Movers: Role of the Individual in History, p. 309.
11. For instance, letter to Rajendra Prasad from New Delhi, 11 November, 1946, n. 6, Vol. III.
12. n. 6.
13. n. 2, p. 449.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 448.
15. n. 6, p. xxxiv.
16. *Ibid.*
17. n. 6, Vol. I, p. xx.
18. Shankar, V., My Reminiscences of Sardar Patel, Vol. I, p. 174.
19. Graham, B.D., Hindu Nationalism and Indian Politics, p. 18.
20. n. 18, Vol. II, p. 174.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
22. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 174.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
24. Letter dated 30 December 1947 to each other. Shankar V., Ed.,

Sardar Patel: Select Correspondence, pp. 288-89.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 294-95.
26. n. 18, Vol. II, pp. 199-200.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
28. Speeches of Sardar Patel, 1947-50, "A United India", p. 69.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 176-77.
30. Letter to Jawaharlal Nehru by Vallabh Bhai Patel on 27 February 1948, n. 6, Vol. VI, p. 56.
31. *Ibid.*, p. xxxiii.
32. "The Verdict", RSS Publication, 1968. (Relating to trial of 1948-49).
33. n. 18, p. 146.
34. n. 31.
35. Q., Jain, Meenakshi, "Will the Real Malkani Please Stand Up", *Times of India*, 30 July 1996, p. 10.
36. Ambedkar, B.R., Pakistan or Partitioning of India, Chapter IV.
37. Golwalkar, M.S., Thoughts on Current Problems, p. 20.
38. The Raja's letter, 14 November 1947, and the Sardar's reply, 25 November 1947; n. 6, Vol. V, p. 501.
39. Letter dated 21 May 1947, *Ibid.*, p. 319.

5

BHIM RAO AMBEDKAR

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar (1891-1956) though happened to be in the Gandhian era constituted a distinct stream in India's social and political history. He represents the great Protestant movement in Hinduism in twentieth century. But the unfortunate part is that he has been made regimented in a particular social class and posed against Hinduism in a way which may be poignant to Ambedkar himself. He condemned certain pernicious practices of Hindu society which is nothing but usual for a reformer. But the fact is that he became aggressive and offensive. In spite of this kind of functioning he was not alienated from the fundamentals of Hinduness and nationalism embedded with it. No thinker could be read in part which might obviously lead to fallacious conclusion. Appraisal of entirety of his thinking rests on holistic nationalism—the term itself being employed by him in veritable Indian sense. Consequently the life-lines of Hindu nationalism clearly echo in his intellectual make-up.

Ambedkar's concept of nationalism may be recalled to begin the deliberation. To him, nationalism is the most dynamic force of modern times.[1] He defines nationalism as "a feeling. It is a feeling of corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those who are charged

with it to feel that they are kith and kin. It is a feeling of consciousness of kind which on the one hand binds together those who have it on the other, serves them for those who are not of their kind. It is a longing not to belong to any other group."[2] An author summarises his thought on nationalism thus: "A nation is composed of people belonging to single tribe, having single origin, culture, religion, language and homogeneous way of life distinct from similar people belonging to different geographical territory, having single identity of their own."[3] Ambedkar further writes, nationality means consciousness of kind, awareness of the existence of that tie of kinship. Nationalism means, "the desire for a separate national existence for those who are bound by this tie of kinship". So he concedes that there cannot be nationalism without the feeling of nationality being in existence.[4]

Ambedkar thought of the entire nation as one unit and had the comprehensive vision of the whole-society.[5] To him, the main bond of binding together human beings into a society is an ardent faith in the common unity of purpose among different members of a society. Without such purposive life society cannot come into being. Society is a process of associating in such ways that experiences, ideas, emotions, beliefs, thoughts and values may be transmitted not only among members but to future members or from generation to generation.[6]

Ambedkar visualised this vast Indian nation ascribing its inception to Vedic era. He scrutinised its successive phases of growth reinforced with kaleidoscopic vicissitude of social changes. As a cumulative product of history Ambedkar emerges in the long-run as John Calvin and Martin Luther in relation to the depressed classes left behind by the mainstream of Hindu society over the centuries. Introspective study undoubtedly unfolds that degeneration had crept into the Hindu society, and which were strengthened by repeated foreign aggressions and follow-up regimes since Hindu society became more defensive without and rigid within. For generations it

became incorrigible and Ambedkar had to adopt hardline methods. But it is inept to insulate him from the nationalist line in term of culture, and as such he was a great messiah of cultural nationalism. As a patriot he was rebellious at par with Ram Mohan and Dayananda.

Ambedkar had quarrel with the casteism and social disparity emerging out of it—particularly of unbridled practice of untouchability, a heinous ignominy of Hindu society. It was in fact the distorted version of Manusmriti in post-Mahabharata era gaining aberration in medieval period. However, Ambedkar upheld the basic tenet of 'varnashrama' interpreted by the great philosophers which was free from the scholastic dogma. He traced out Bhagvat Gita for the purpose. In his words, "The 'varna' system of the Bhagvat Gita has at least two merits. It does not say that it is based on birth. Indeed, it makes a special point that each man's 'varna' is fixed according to his innate qualities. It does not say that occupation of the son shall be that of the father. It says that the profession of a person shall be according to his innate qualities."[7]

At this juncture let there be a little deviation to stretch the deliberation. The very caste factor involves the Aryan non-Aryan dichotomy comprising Aryan (Hindu) foundation of India. Ambedkar contributed a volume for the purpose entitled "Who were the Shudras? How they came to the fourth varna?" He quotes 'Purusha Sukta', which speaks of the Indo-Aryan nation, that it was made up of the five tribes, which had become assimilated into one common Indo-Aryan people. Those tribes denote Gandharvas, Pitris, Devas, Asuras and Rakshasas.[8] There is no mention of any fourth varna of the Hindus. It was the undesirable offshoot of perverted history constructed under the predilection of Aryan invasion theory. So far as the testimony of the Vedic literature is concerned it is against the theory that the original home of the Aryan was outside India.[9]

The Aryan invasion theory, Ambedkar holds, has its origin in the belief that the Aryans are a European race and as a European race it is presumed to be superior to the Asiatic race. Knowing that nothing can prove the superiority of the Aryan race better than invasion and conquest of native races, the western writers have proceeded to invent the story of the invasion of India by the Aryans and the conquest by them of the 'Dasas' and 'Dasyus'.[10] The theory is based on fault assumptions and influences, Ambedkar claimed. He further adds that it is not deduced from known facts. On the contrary, the facts are preconceived and selected to prove it.[11] To Ambedkar, Arya is a measure of culture and not the name of a race. He felt that the people in the south of India were always called Arya.[12] He unfailingly argued that the term Arya was not justifying caste, but significantly one's quality.[13] In the long-run, he denied that a racial or colour basis was behind caste.[14]

The factor of Aryan invasion is being challenged by the Hindu nationalists right since the days of Bal Gangadhar Tilak so mush so that the theory blasts the concept of one people, one culture, one nation, and gives rise to composite culture syndrome. The Anglicised historians manufactured it to axe the grind of cultural pluralism and consequent division of Indian society. The Indian intellectuals became the ready-made victim of the calculated move of the colonial master. Ambedkar was well aware of the divisive design of the so-called academic works.

To Ambedkar, people in this vast territory known as 'Jambudvipa' in Purana had the same culture though they differed in their dresses, language, food-habits for their culture was moulded and highly influenced by schools of thought having origin in different parts of this vast territory but they were bound together by the same thought, same way of thinking, same way of logic and regular exchange of views so well as commodities.[15] It is evident that he was repeatedly used the expression 'Hindu

India' in his superb work "Thoughts on Pakistan" beside other works[16] since it is axiomatic.

Ambedkar's study of the caste problem involves four main points; viz.—

(1) Despite the composite make up of the Hindu population, there is deep cultural unity.
(2) Caste is a parcelling into bits of a larger cultural unity.
(3) There was one caste to start with.
(4) Classes have become castes through imitation and examination.[17]

Ambedkar quotes V.D. Savarkar according to whom, "The followers of Vedicism, Sanatanism, Jainism, Buddhism, Linguism, Sikhism, the Arya Samaj, the Brahmo Samaj, the Deva Samaj, and such other religions of Indian origin are Hindus and constitute Hindudom, i.e., Hindu people as a whole—consequently the so-called aboriginal or hill-tribes also are Hindus; because India is their Fatherland as well as their Holy Land, whatever form of religion or worship they follow". Ambedkar feels that this definition of the term Hindu has been framed with great care and caution. "It is designed to serve two purposes which Mr. Savarkar has in view. First to exclude from it Muslims, Christians, Parsis and Jews by prescribing the recognition of India as a Holy Land as a qualification for being a Hindu. Secondly, to include Buddhists, Jains, Sikhs, etc. by not insisting upon belief in the sanctity of the Vedas as an element in the qualification.[18] Keeping this study in mind, while speaking on the Hindu Code Bill in the Constituent Assembly Dr. Ambedkar urged the members to have a common code which could do away with the rules of Hindu Law scattered in innumerable (judicial) decisions.[19] Moreover, it would include in it the Vira Shaivas or Lingayats, Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Sabha, Arya Samaj as well as the Buddhists, Jains and Sikhs.[20] Therefore, his plea was

that simply provision enacting temple entry of the untouchables is not enough. "All that it can do is to recognise them as nationals and not aliens.[21] His reading was that the religion of India has experienced three changes. "Vedic religion which practised first gave way, in course of time, to Brahminism and this in turn to Hinduism."[22] Leaving aside his allergy to Brahminism, Ambedkar's contribution to the moulding of the Hindu culture and civilisation on the basis of equality and fraternity is great.[23]

Hindu nationalism has nothing to do with anti-Islamic syndrome. But nor can they wipe out the writing on the wall of Indian history. Hindus have tried to internalise the wrongs of history unilaterally, but the evil consequences yet remain intact challenging the very existence of Hindu culture—the soul of the Indian nation. Objective analysis and interpretation of history is imperative to right the wrongs, failing which a camouflaged disease is constraint to erupt by any means; and the Indians have experienced to the fullest extent. As a serious student of history Ambedkar was not shy of it and he tried to expose the Himalayan lapses of history. In this venture he was vocal on the wanton Muslim invasions, their pillages and consequent subjection; which catastrophically torpedoed the course of national life in India. Another noticeable point here is that he was open throated on this dimension when his contemporaries were mortally afraid of possible 'minority' retaliation against the "sacred temple of secularism".

Ambedkar presents a graphic and harrowing picture on the tarnished pages of history taking leaves from Cunningham's "Ancient Geography of India" and massively from Dr. Titus's "Indian Islam", and devotes Chapter IV in his superb work "Pakistan, or Partitioning India" under the title "Break-up of Unity"—the title itself suggesting his psyche. He takes account of invasion of Mohammad Bin Quasim in 711 A.D., of Mohammad of Ghazni in 1001 A.D., of Mohammad Ghori in 1206 A.D., of Chenghiz

Khan in 1221, of Taimur in 1398, of Babar in 1526 A.D., of Nadir Shah in 1739 A.D., and Ahmadshah Abdalli in 1761 A.D. These were not merely aggressions of warrior-kings as usual in medieval period, to plunder material property and establish political hegemony as some authors like Rajani Palme Dutt have tried to project;[24] but it aimed at barbarous destruction of the indigenous culture and religion in the name of performing their "holy religious task" on one hand and gaining sadistic pleasure on the other. In the words of Ambedkar, "There is no doubt that striking a blow at the idolatry and polytheism of Hindus and establishing Islam in India" was one of these expeditions.[25] In one of his despatches to Hajjaj, Mohammad Bin Quasim is quoted to have said, "The nephew of Raja Dahir, his warriors and principal officers have been destroyed. In stead of idol temples, mosques and other places of worship have been created, the Kutbah is read. . . "[26]

Summing up the evidence on the point Dr. Titus concludes: "Of the destructions of temples and the desecration of idols we have an abundance of evidence. Mohammad Bin Quasim carried out his plan of destruction systematically in Sindh, we have seen, but he made an exception of the famous temple at Multan for purposes of revenue, as this temple was a place resort of pilgrims, who made large gifts to the idol. Nevertheless, while he thus satisfied his avarice by letting the temple stand, he gave vent to his malignity by having a cow's flesh tied around the neck of the idol."[27] Al' Utbi, the historian of Mohammad of Ghazni, writes , "He demolished idol temples and established Islam. He captured. . . destroying idolators, and gratifying Muslims. He then returned home and . . . vowed that every year he would undertake a holy war against the Hindus."[28]

Taimur has in his Memoir explained what led him to invade India. He says, "my object in the invasions of Hindusthan is to lead a campaign against the infidels, to convert them to the true faith according to the command

of Mohammad. . . to purify the land from the defilement of misbelief and polytheism, and over-throw the temples and idols. . ."[29]

The slaughter of Hindus gave a great set back to the indigenous culture of the Hindus as in the conquest of Bihar by Mohammad Khilji.[30] It was left to Aurangzeb to make a final attempt to overthrow idolatry.[31] "In April, 1669 A.D., Aurangzeb learned that in the provinces of Thatta, Multan and Banaras, but especially in the latter, foolish Brahmins were in the habit of expounding frivolous books in their schools . . . The 'Director of Faith' consequently issued orders to all the governors of provinces to destroy temples of the infidels; and they were enjoined to put an entire stop to the worship. . . Later it was reported to his religious Majesty that the Government officers had destroyed the temples of Biswanath at Banaras."[32]

"Qutb-ud Din, whose reputation for destroying temples was almost as great as that of Mohammad, in the latter part of the twelfth century and early years of the thirteenth, must have frequently resorted to force as an incentive to conversion. One instance may be noticed when he approached Koil (Aligarh) in 1194 A.D., those of the garrison who were wise and acute were converted to Islam, but the others were slain with the sword."[33]

"One pathetic case is mentioned in the time of the reign of Firoz Shah (1351-1388 A.D.). An old Brahmin of Delhi had been accused of worshipping idols . . . He was sent for and his case placed before the judges. . . The true faith was declared to him that he must either become a Muslim or be burned; but he refused to accept it. Consequently he was burned." Further, the Kazi explained the legal position of the Hindus under Muslim law to Sultan Ala-ud Din: "Convert them to Islam or kill them."[34]

Such is the story of this period of 762 years which elapsed between the advent of Mohammad of Ghazni and

the return of Ahmad Shah Abadalli.[35] Thus Islam entered India with Koran on one hand and the sword on the other. The spirit that animated then was the spirit of the Jehad—a holy war against the Kaffirs—the non-believers—the cursed—to transform Dar-ul Harb (abode of war) into Dar-ul Islam (abode of Islam)—the two camps of the world defined by Muslim Canon Law.[36] Thus Islam was the first fundamentalist reaction of the culture of India.[37] Ambedkar further observes, "The Hindus' spirit of aggression is a new phase which he has just begun to cultivate. The Muslim's spirit of aggression is his native endowment and is ancient as compared with that of the Hindu. . . The Muslim in this exhibition of the spirit of aggression leaves the Hindu far behind."[38] Ambedkar justifies Hindu reaction quoting a great apostle of peace, Bertrand Russel, which reads: "A conquered nation is like a man with cancer; he can think of nothing else. . . if you break a nation's nationality, it will think of nothing else but getting it set again. It will listen to no reformer, to no philosopher, to no preacher until the demand of the nationalist is granted."[39]

With this background Ambedkar analyses the national questions pertaining to the Muslims. In 1924 the editor of a Bengali paper had an interview with the poet Rabindranath Tagore. The report of this interview states: ". . . another very important factor which, according to the poet, was making it almost impossible for the Mohammedan unity to become an accomplished fact was that the Mohammedans could not confine their patriotism to any one country. . . The poet said that he had very frankly asked many Mohammedans whether, in the event of any Mohammedan power invading India, they would stand side by side with their Hindu neighbours to defend their common land. He could not be satisfied with the reply he got from them. He said that he could definitely state that even such men as Mr. Mohammed Ali had decided that under no circumstances was it permissible for any Mohammedan, whatever his country might be, to stand against any other Mohammedan."[40] "This is the

basis of Pan-Islamism. It is this which leads every Musalman in India to say that he is a Muslim first and Indian afterwards."[41]

Ambedkar further observes, in South Africa, Canada, Switzerland and many countries there are sizeable number of minorities. But why Muslims are afraid of Hindu majority or Hindu Raj?[42] In fact, "there are millions of Musalmans in India who are living under unbridled and uncontrolled Hindu Raj of Hindu Princes and no objection to it has been raised by the Muslims or the Muslim League."[43]

With this study Ambedkar was critical of the demand of Pakistan and contributed a monumental work "Thoughts on Pakistan" in 1941 which was revised next year and published after the title "Pakistan, or Partitioning of India". He sensed the nerve thus: "On the 26th of March 1940, Hindu India was startled to attention as it had never before."[44] "The scheme not only called Hindu India to attention but it shocked Hindu India."[45] However, he posed a peculiar question—"The partition of Bengal was abrogated in 1911 by the British who yielded to the Hindus who were opposed to it. . . If the partition of Bengal had not been annulled the Muslim State in Eastern Bengal. . . would now have been 39 years old. . . Is the idea of separation of Pakistan from Hindusthan shocking?"[46] Yet he felt that "the Hindu sentiment is quite natural, that is to claim India as a nation, which was denied by the Anglo-Indians."[47] "It may be open to Hindus to ask Mr. Jinnah, if he is in favour of a Muslim majority in Muslim Provinces, why he is opposed to a Hindu majority in the Centre? . . . The abandonment of the principle of majority rule in politics cannot affect the Hindus very much in other walks of life. As an element of social life they will remain a majority."[48] Ambedkar's proposal was for a "United India"[49] as the popular Hindu sentiment swept then.

Simultaneously Ambedkar argued in favour of

partition. Ostensibly it is ironical, but the ground is sensitive. In his words, "The association of Muslim in the Army would be disadvantageous to Hindusthan. . . A safe Army is better than a safe border."[50] "Can the Hindus depend upon such an Army (composed of Muslims) to defend the country against the invasion of Afghanistan? . . . The realist must take note of the fact that the Musalmans look upon the Hindus as Kaffirs, who deserve more to be exterminated than protected."[51]

Ambedkar quipped, "I dislike them (Muslims), I do not hate them—it is because I love India more."[52] To him, national unity must be founded on a sense of kinship. It must be spiritual, not merely geographical or administrative;[53] and "it is the unity of culture that is the basis of homogeneity."[54] Therefore, he rather pleaded for the unification of India and Burma[55] who share abundant cultural unity because of having Hinduism and Buddhism respectively.

This kind of culture-based nationalist factor prompted Dr. Ambedkar to accept Buddhism instead of Islam or Christianity. He was emphatic that his Dalit followers must embrace some religion; but ought to be very careful of it. To quote him, "It is necessary to consider the repercussion on the nation due to a change of religion by the untouchables. If they embrace Islam or Christianity, they will become anti-nationals. If they will become Muslims, Muslim population will double and so Muslim influence will increase. In case they become Christian, Christian population will become 5 to 6 crores and the British strangle-hold on this country will be higher still. But if they become Buddha, the future of India will not be endangered and they will not be anti-national. Hence if at all untouchables must change religion they may become Buddha."[56] "Buddhist religion is an integral part of Indian culture itself. I have taken all care to see that this conversion does not harm this country's culture, history and traditions."[57]

Some of the activists of Bahujan Samaj had mentioned in a wall writing recently that Buddhism is the earliest religion of India—not Hinduism. That is of course true. Hinduism is not a religion in semitic sense of the term. There is no definite prophet or first preceptor who initiated it—no date of its inauguration-no definite holy scripture—no definite temple or God. Hinduism is the way of life sprouted on this land since time immemorial. It is a commonwealth of sects. Moreover, the term Hindu gained currency much later. Under this test Buddhism is definitely the first religion of India. But it does not militate against the fundamentals of Hinduism. Buddhism was at best a protestant movement. But the understanding of the so-called followers of Ambedkar at the moment is different. This point is substantiated by V.H. Desai thus, "Buddhism is not fundamentally different from Hinduism. . . Buddha's system of practical ethics is undoubtedly a child of Vedicism."[58]

Earlier Ambedkar was also contemplating to embrace Sikhism. In his words , "If the Depressed Classes join Islam or Christianity they not only go out of the Hindu religion but also of Hindu culture; but if they become Sikhs they remain within the Hindu culture. This is by no means a small advantage to the Hindus". These remarks exhibit his attachment to Hinduism and its culture or rather "Indianness", observes Madhu Lemaye, which he was not prepared to give up.[59]

Ambedkar was careful that "any division in our country will again deprive us of our freedom. As a result of several centuries of slavery it is possible that several distortions like discrimination between high and low, economic disparities, backwardness and casteism have crept into our society. But if some foreigners try to use these as a tool to deprive us of our identity we shall not allow this to happen. We shall frustrate their intentions. It is our domestic matter and, therefore, we shall settle it almost ourselves. For our benefit, or to get out of our socially backward position, we shall not become tools in

the hands of foreigners. We have to be cautious about those who act as Jaichands among us. We should well realise the interest of the nation and the society of which we are part and parcel."[60]

Certain aspects clearly emerge on the basis of which Ambedkar may be bracketed with the Hindu nationalists. He perceived, like the latter, that India was enslaved not only during the British rule, as viewed by Jawaharlal Nehru beside the entire host of secularists, but it dates back to thousand years of history with Semitic invasions.[61] He is pained to learn the rap of Indian culture by the invaders. He also clearly discerns that the growth of Islam and the repeated invasions synchronised together. In other words, he does not view them as separate phenomenons. Similarly, from his statement at the time of acceptance of Buddhism it is clear that he bracketed Christianity with British imperialism.

Further, Ambedkar puts emphasis on religion in Indian context. In his words, "A study of the history of India illustrates that religion is the source of power and with the support of religious doctrines the priests hold sway over the common man often greater than the king."[62] Moreover, he makes distinction between Religion and Dharma. "The purpose of the Religion is to explain the origin of the world. The purpose of Dharma is to reconstruct the world."[63] Other technical differences crop up further.

Again, when Ambedkar was a member of the Flag Committee of the Constituent Assembly, a delegation came to meet him at the Bombay air port. The delegation even presented him with a saffron flag requesting him to make plea for its acceptance. Receiving the flag, Ambedkar told them, "On my point, I would advocate the adoption of this flag. However, my advocacy would not suffice; it would have to be supported by big people's movement. It is only then my proposal would be strengthened."[64]

Ambedkar, again, pleaded for having a common civil code, thus: "We should take the Hindu law, the Muslim law, the laws governing the Christians and other communities and their sects and find out a common denominator."[65] To him, it was imperative to bring about legal clarity and uniformity and above all national solidarity.

Ambedkar's emphasis was on retaining the Indian traditions in every walk of life. It clearly shows that the integrating tendencies in him were potent.[66] In spite of his critics he did not like to exclude the Muslims from the national life. Rather he sought to integrate them with assertion that the Hindus and Indian Muslims belong to the same racial stock,[67] and hence there could be no difference of culture.

Ambedkar's vision was of an Integrated Society[68]—free from social chasm and collision. This kind of analysis basically conforms the essence of Integral Humanism. His insistence on reservation of seats for the Dalits was aimed at strengthening the entire Hindu society. It was not divisive, though apprehended by many. His angle was to elevate the weaker side of the society. Moreover, his argument fell on the same line of Communal Award. If the religious minorities could be provided with special safeguard why the down-trodden of the Hindu society would be deprived of the same type of package?[69]

Ambedkar appreciated the RSS methodology of emotional integration of the untouchables with the rest of the Hindu community. But his only reservation was that, according to him, the RSS was moving with low pace, whereas he was hurried to accomplish his objective at earliest possible time by means of launching mass social movements. It is evident that he shared the platform with none but the founder of RSS himself, Dr. Keshav Baliram Hedgewar, on the occasion of Makar Sankranti Utsav at Poona in 1939, and was impressed with the latter's thinking on social harmony.[70]

Ambedkar is erroneously posed by the present day worshippers of him as a messiah of exclusively the untouchables. This is not wholly correct appraisal since his spectrum was much larger—the whole community, the whole nation, its chequered history and sublime culture. His concern was to build up a resurgent nation of the kind the Hindu nationalists perceived. The whole thing is that each thinker and activist is circumscribed by his assigned task determined by the given historical perspective. Their language may be different depending on the rôle they discharge, but the tone and tenor draw the same signification. Their common meeting ground become clear while pondering over vital issues.

Ambedkar is honoured as a Hindu nationalist not because he was fiercely critical of the Muslims as a community, but because his analysis was directed to unfold the greater vicissitude of Indian cultural history and the innate foundation of nationalism. It was his nationalistic objective study—a scholarly submission for scrutiny in view of ushering into an era of national reconstruction. Thus, he carried in himself the positive traits of the Hindu nationalists. The fact is that he was concerned with a particular section—a feeble class, but which is to be reckoned with grand Hindu consolidation. He took recourse of history in this venture, and rendered a great task in exposing the erosion of history which had become embedded in the very core of the academicians brought up in the lap of the denationalised forces at work. As a sequel, the very cause of the Hindu nationalism got acceleration intellectually.

Even in social level Ambedkar's scheme of thing was inclusive. Had he been a separatist, the present course of Indian history would have moved adversely. It is but for his statesmanship that the Hindu nationalist forces found a kind of encouragement. He was greatly responsible in jettisoning removal of the social chasm of unprecedented dimension by adopting both defensive and offensive stand. The whole matter has been diluted owing

to a number of distortions of the present day street politics and easy-going method of the vested interests. He has been erroneously put within a narrow regiment though being paid honour in various ways. Many of his writings are yet elusive. There is no proper deliberation on him even in academic circle. He is unnecessarily put against Gandhi and even against Hinduism. A perusal study would dispel all these apprehensions. The present author has well-founded basis to feel that the real Ambedkar is yet to be discovered since his feet is made known to the common audience while his head is ignored by the intellectuals.

Conclusively, Ambedkar was a great nationalist. He defined nation and nationalism in the same form as Vivekananda did—that nationalism is a distilled concept, an idea of commonness, a feeling of common heart-beating; and with this he did not stop. He ventured to probe the basis of this heart-beating in national scale in India, and he sensed the indigenous culture and tradition of India, which was so dearer to him; for which he did not like to alienate the fundamentals of Hinduism in spite of certain reservations. His writings and speeches echoe the same substance as expressed by Vivekananda and Annie Besant—that is Hinduness, the basis, the soul, the spirit and the message of India.

Notes and References

1. Ambedkar, B.R., Pakistan or Partitioning of India, p. 101.
2. Ambedkar, B.R., Thoughts on Pakistan, p. 23.
3. Shukla, J.J., B.R. Ambedkar on Hinduism, p. 347.
4. n. 1, p. 21.
5. Manjutkar, M.P., Dr. Ambedkar and Parliamentary Democracy, p. x.
6. n. 3, p. 359.
7. Ambedkar, B.R., Gandhi and Gandhism, p. 149.
8. Ambedkar, B.R., Who were the Shudras? p. 30.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 79. This aspect of Ambedkar has been mentioned in

Vol. 1 of the present work in detail.

11. Ramdas, R.V., "Dr. Ambedkar on Aryan Invasion", *Organiser*, 11 April 1993, p. 8. Even Sir Berbert Risley, "the great divider", conceded in the introduction of his work; "The People of India" that the ethnic division of the Hindu society is deduced on the basis of prevailing traditions. It means it is based purely on imagination—throwing the present into past.
12. Thengadi, D.B., Sanket Rekha, p. 286.
13. Satpathy, S., Indian Culture, p. 93.
14. Ambedkar, B.R., "Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development", *Indian Antiquity*, Vol. 41, May 1917, p. 81.
15. n. 3, p. 348.
16. Repeated thrice in page 3 and 6 of Thoughts on Pakistan. Also in page 4 of Gandhi and Gandhism, beside other works.
17. n. 14, pp. 81, 95.
18. n. 1, p. 130.
19. Lokhande, G.S., Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar: A Study in Social Democracy, p. 147.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 152.
21. n. 7, p. 100.
22. Speech delivered in Colombo on 5 June 1950, *Ibid.*, p. 124. Also, Ahir, A.C., comp., Ambedkar on Buddhism.
23. n. 23, Foreword, Bhole, R.R., p. xi.
24. Dutt, Rajani Palme, India Today, Prof. Bipin Chandra and others followed him, dealt in Vol. 1 of the present work.
25. n. 1, p. 37.
26. Dr. Titus, Indian Islam, p. 10, Q., *Ibid.*
27. Dr. Titus, *Ibid.*, 22-34, Q., *Ibid.*, p. 40.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
29. Poole, Lane, Medieval India, p. 155, Q., *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
32. Dr. Titus, *op. cit.*, p. 24, Q., *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32, Q., *Ibid.*, p. 43.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 29, Q., *Ibid.*, p. 46.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*, p. 287.
37. n. 3., p. 349.
38. n. 1., p. 239.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 238.
40. "Through Indian Eyes", *Times of India*, 18 April 1924, Q., *Ibid.*, p. 268
41. *Ibid.*, pp. 291-92.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 353-54.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 352.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
48. "Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar's Writings and Speeches", Vol. 1, p. 377.
49. Address to the All India Scheduled Castes Federation, 6 May 1945, *Ibid.*, p. 376.
50. n. 1, p. 101.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
52. Ambedkar, B.R., Gandhi and Jinnah: Writings and Speeches, 1943, p. 209.
53. n. 1, p. 48.
54. Q., Moon, Vasant, Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar's Writings and Speeches, Vol. 1, p. 6.
55. n. 1, p. 49.
56. Q., Mishra, D.N., RSS: Myth and Reality, p. 125.
57. Q., Bhandari and Ramaswamy, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar: A Patriot, p. 83.
58. Desai, V.H., "Relevance of Dr. Ambedkar Today", in Narain Rao, J.S., Ed., B.R. Ambedkar: His Relevance Today, p. 6.
59. Lemaye, Madhu, Prime Movers: Role of the Individual in History, p. 282.
60. n. 57, p. 8.
61. *Ibid.*
62. Q., n. 19, p. 87.
63. Das, Bhagwan, Thus Spoke Ambedkar, Vol. I, Intr., p. 22.
64. n. 57, pp. 10-11.
65. n. 62, Vol. II, p. 206.
66. n. 5, p. xx.
67. n. 1, pp. 13-14.
68. n. 19, pp. 50-63.
69. On 19 September 1932 a Hindu leaders' conference was held in Bombay under the Presidentship of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in the context of depressed classes. Rajendra Prasad and Ambedkar beside others, attended it (Tendulkar, D.G., Mahatma, Vol. 3, pp. 166-67). Argument of both sides intended to strengthen the Hindu society notwithstanding their mode of plea. It also indicates that Ambedkar's name finds place in the row of the Hindu leaders.
70. Rashtradeep, special issue, December 1996.

6

S. RADHAKRISHNAN

Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan (1888-1975) is replete with the traits of Platonic Philosopher King in modern India. Next to Vivekananda he is the most consistent and forceful propagator of Hindu ideal and philosophy before the world of intellect. He is in the true line of descent from the ancient Hindu philosophers who have from time to time rescued the spirit of religion from the 'secular' thought and practice.[1] In the words of S. Gopal, "His reading of Hinduism provided the base for his philosophy of idealism. His efforts to cleans Hinduism and restore vitality promoted social concern and action. Like Gandhi, he too was in the highest degree and at the same time a Hindu, an Indian, and a world citizen, and the three attitudes were not only compatible but merged into one."[2] He was truly India's cultural ambassador to the West.

Radhakrishnan received his education for twelve years in Christian Missionary institution near Madras. The criticism by the Christian Missionaries of Hinduism rather strengthened his belief in it. He was more influenced by a surreptitious reading of the letters of Swami Vivekananda, with their eloquent appeal to India's youth to evince pride and self-respect and this "vague sense of nationalism" was further quickened by the reading, also in clandestine circulation of V.D. Savarkar's

"The Indian War of Independence".[3] In the Madras session of Indian National Congress, December 1908 Annie Besant's lecture thrilled him most, who spoke on ponegyrics on India and on Hinduism.[4] Though Indian philosophy was not in the University curricula in M.A., Radhakrishnan submitted a desertation entitled "The Ethics of the Vedanta and Its Metaphysical Presuppositions". He served as Professor of Oriental Philosophy in Oxford, and was invited later by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to assume the Office of Vice Chancellor, Banaras Hindu University. He also incorporated there discipline on Hindu philosophy in spite of little discouraging attitude of some top ranking leaders. He offered the post of Vice-Chancellorship of BHU to Shyama Prasad Mukherjee when he himself had to visit abroad for academic purpose for a long period. When Pandit Malaviya passed away in November 1946 Radhakrishnan felt obliged to stay on a while longer and suggested to Mukherjee that he come as Pro-Vice Chancellor and look after the day-to-day administration under his (Radhakrishnan's) guidance.

Radhakrishnan's edited work of the Bhagvat Gita got published in the spring of 1948.[5] By means of his enormous simple writings he made the product of westernism easily accessible to the sublime cultural heritage of India. He wrote extensibly applauding and justifying Hindu culture, glorifying its past and preaching and projecting it for adoption to the intellectual elite class.[6] Like Vivekananda, Radhakrishnan reminds his countrymen of the great Indian traditions of peace, tolerance and brotherhood and the world's attention to the spiritual values on which alone a new community of mankind can be founded and realised.[7] But in his quest for humanism he was not oblivious of the nation's plight. It is the incorrigible show-habit of the Indian intellectuals to present themselves and interpret the great men of India as personification of world teacher without having ground at home. Radhakrishnan's quest for the religion of the spirit reveals that he is thoroughly rooted in the Hindu philosophic tradition of 'mystic idealism'.[8]

Like Ambedkar, Radhakrishnan analyses nationality as "a corporate and spiritual sentiment."[9] To him, the sense of corporateness is forged by traditions of common history and values such as wisdom, love and sacrifice.[10] Nationalism is the consciousness which nations have acquired of their genius when once they are personified.[11] In another context he observes, "Any society of men animated by a feeling of solidarity is a nation."[12] Like Aurobindo, he believes that nations are natural and necessary forms continuing as intermediate stage between the individual and mankind.[13] However, two requisites of a nation are, way of life, and a society typified by a sense of solidarity.[14] A nation cut off from its roots cannot last long.[15] "Geography, history, a common inheritance. . . contribute to national integration" and "national feeling is sustained by the love of the land in which we live, the historical traditions we inherit and the hope of common future."[16] "Nations have a history as well as a geography. They live and grow, not by the forces of mind and rain, sun and stars, but by the passions and ideals which animate them. The University must stimulate an interest in the sources of our civilisation, its art and thought, its language and literature, its philosophy and religion."[17] This analysis is the exact replica of the classical Hindu nationalists like Vivekananda and Aurobindo. It clearly leads one to find Hinduness beneath the door-step of Indian nationalism and nothing short of it.

Radhakrishnan had no go but to discover Hindu root of India. To him, India is a nation for "it is not a geographical expression, nor it is a collection of individuals, but it is a tradition, an order of thought and manners, a loyalty to certain fundamental values fostered by all races and religions that have found a home in this land."[18] He analyses this historically and further observes, "In our country, however fast we may try. . . the traces of antiquity are all about us. The earth's surface is not raw but subtly moulded by old time. No nation can grow if it has not its roots in the past. We cannot start an entirely new civilisation; we might as well try to build a

new tree. We have to work within the geographical limits imposed by the past, which no power on earth can undo. The spirit of the past can be gathered from the history of the people. If we go to the Indian history in order to learn and not inflict on her own petty prejudices, we find there not a fixed programme, but a continuing spirit. The creative tradition, the living past, is like a seed that grows and not like a log of wood."[19]

"To improve the present condition of Indian society", Radhakrishnan argues, "to reshape its life in a fashion equal to the magnitude of the times, we must rediscover its soul, what we have in our blood by inheritance, those wordless ideals, the things that lie in the depths of our being as permanent potentialities. Our values do not change; but the ways and means of expressing them do India puts spiritual values higher than others."[20]

Radhakrishnan further elucidates, "As the typical religion of India, Hinduism represents the spirit. . . that has extraordinary vitality as to survive political and social changes. From the beginning of recorded history Hinduism has borne witness to the sacred flame of spirit which must remain for ever, even while dynasties crash and empires tumble into ruins. It alone can give our civilisation a soul, and men and women a principle to live by."[21]

Radhakrishnan believes that India's culture has a certain unity, though on examination it dissolves into a variety of shades and colours.[22] He quotes Vincent Smith and maintains that the Hindus remain a distinct cultural unit, with a common history, a common literature, and a common civilisation.[23] When Savarkar analysed like this the protagonists of minoritism saw a kind of two-nation theory even stronger than Jinnah. This kind of partial study is dangerous to the nation as well as a matter of self-deception. Vivekananda, Savarkar and Radhakrishnan not only talk of distinct Hindu culture but visualise the soul or the foundation of India in the form of Hinduness. If Jinnah and his brigade would have

accepted this land as sacred there would have been no communal flare up and Indian intellectuals of Jinnah-line would not have smelt communalism in Hinduness.

Well, Radhakrishnan delivers much on the etymological aspect of Hinduism in order to establish its Indianness. He feels that one is confronted, at the outset, by the difficulty of defining what Hinduism is. He maintains that the Hindu civilisation is so called since its original founders or earliest followers occupied the territory drained by the Sindhu (the Indus) river system[24] corresponding to the North-West Frontier province and the Punjab. This is recorded in the Rig Veda, the oldest of the Vedas, the Hindu scriptures which give their name to this period of Indian history. The people on the Indian side of the Sindhu were called Hindu by the Persian and the later western invaders. From the Punjab, the civilisation flowed over into the valley of the Ganges where it met with numerous cults of primitive tribes. In its south ward march the Aryan culture got into touch with the Dravidian and ultimately dominated it, though undergoing some modification from its influence. As the civilisation extended over the whole of India, it suffered many changes, but it kept up its continuity with the old Vedic type developed on the banks of the Sindhu. The term Hindu has originally a territorial and not a credal significance. It implies residence in a well-defined geographical area. Aboriginal tribes, savages and half civilised people, the cultured Dravidians and the Vedic Aryans were all Hindus as they were the sons of the same mother.[25]

Some of the great religions of the world select one or the other of the nations, exalt it to the highest rank, make it the centre and relate all else to it. They become so intolerant as to ignore the possibility of other religions and insist on one's acceptance of its own point of view as giving the sole right of citizenship in the spiritual world. But Hinduism provides enough freedom for a man to go forward and develop his own characteristic line. A

catholic religion like Hinduism expresses itself in a variety of forms and comprehends all the relations which exist between man and God. In Hinduism the descriptions of the supreme are many-sided and comprehensive.[26] No country and no religion have adopted the attitude of understanding and appreciation of other faiths so persistently and consistently "as India and Hinduism and its offshoot Buddhism". St. Thomas arrived in India in 52 A.D., and the Syrian Christians of Malavar claim to have descended from Christians converted by St. Thomas. The followers of Zorastrianism, when they were expelled from their country owing to Mohammedan persecution, took shelter in India in 716 A.D. "While the Parsis came as fugitives, the Muslims and the Christians came as conquerors"—to use the exact words of Radhakrishnan.[27]

However, the element of accommodation must not over-shadow the factor of assimilation, a potential virtue of Hinduism. "In the Mahabharata we are told that the Yavanas (Greeks), the Kiratas, the Daradas (Dards), the Chinese (the Chinese), the Shaks (Scythions), the Pahlavas (Parthians), several other non-Hindu peoples, belonged to one or the other four classes. These foreign tribes were absorbed into Hindu society. The sort of social adjustment, by which foreigners are admitted into the Hindu fold, has taken place from very early fold, has taken place from very early times. So long as the foreigners followed the general traditions and common law of the society, they were treated as Hindus."[28] "The theists and the atheists, the sceptics and the agnostics may all be Hindus if they accept the Hindu system of culture and life. Hinduism insists not on religious conformity but on a spiritual and ethical outlook. . . Hinduism is. . . a fellowship of all who accept the law of right and earnestly seek for the truth."[29] Regarding Buddhism he clarified that it is a Hindu reformatory religion. Again, he makes one point clear in the context of assimilation that it must not be construed with prosylitisation,[30] as present day secularists are scared of majority dominance over the minority when the question of assimilation is referred.

Radhakrishnan believes that ". . Hinduism is not a definite sect, but a commonwealth of sects". "Hinduism is an inheritance of thought and aspiration to which every race in India has made its distinctive contribution."[31] But he makes it crystal clear that "though peoples of different races and cultures have been pouring into India from the dawn of history, Hinduism has been able to maintain its supremacy, and even the prosylitising creeds backed by political power have not been able to coerce the large majority of Indians of their views. The Hindu culture possesses to some other more forceful currents. It is no more necessary to dissect Hinduism than to open a tree to see whether the sap still runs."[32] He looks at Hinduism as more a life than a form of thought. To him, it is a movement, and not a position, a process, not a result, a growing tradition, not a fixed revelation.[33]

Dr. Radhakrishnan's study is that what peculiarity distinguishes India from the rest of the existing world is the strong survival of distinct inheritance from the remote past.[34] "The age of the Vedic seers was a period of vigour and vitality when India gave voice to immortal thoughts. The great epic of the Mahabharata gives us a wonderful picture of seeking life, full of the freedom of enquiry and experiment . . . In the age of the Buddha, the country was stirred to its utter-most depths."[35] "Any one who has studied and meditated on the ancient classics of this country will testify to their peculiar greatness, their power to yield new meanings and their inexhaustible value as a criterion of present-day modes of life."[36] So he believes that a study of our past would lead to a quickening of our cultural life and a triumph over scholasticism.[37]

Radhakrishnan's revelation is that "Hinduism is not limited to the geographical area which is described as India. Its way in early days spread to Campa, Cambodia, Java and Bali. There is nothing which prevents from extending to the uttermost parts of the earth. India is a tradition, a spirit, a light. Her physical and spiritual frontiers do not coincide."[38] The ideal sage of ancient

India exclaims, "While there is a soul in prison, I am not free; while there is an enslaved community, I belong to it."[39] This is a basic feature of Hinduism—that it is universalistic. Of course, the Hindu nationalists are not oblivious of its Indian base. It also vindicates another characteristic, that is cultural export to foreign lands as distinguished from political influence.

Radhakrishnan underlines, "After a long winter of some centuries, we are today in one of the creative periods of Hinduism. We are beginning to look upon over ancient faith with fresh eyes. We feel that our society is in a condition of unstable equilibrium. There is much wood that is dead and diseased that has to be cleared away. Leaders of Hindu thought and practice are convinced that the times require, not a surrender of the basic principles of Hinduism, but a restatement of them with special reference to the needs of a more complex and mobile social order. Such an attempt will only be the repetation of a process which has occupied a number of times in the history of Hinduism. The work of readjustment is in process. Growth is slow when roots are deep. But those who light a little candle in the darkness will help to make the whole sky aflame."[40]

"Throughout the history of Hinduism the leaders of thought and practice have been continually busy experimenting with new forms, developing new ideals to suit new conditions. The first impulse of progress came with the native tribes. A similar impulse contributed to the protestant movements of Jainism and Buddhism when the Aryans moved out into the Gangetic valley. Contact with the highly civilised Dravidians led to the transformation of Vedicism into a theistic religion. The reform movements of Ramananda, Chaitanya, Kabir and Nanak show the stimulus of Islam. The Brahmo Samaj and the Arya Samaj are the outcome of the contact with western influence,[41] and yet Hinduism is not to be dismissed as a mere flow and strife of opinions, for it represents a steady growth of insight, since every form of

Hinduism and every stage of its growth is related to the common background of Vedanta. . . It is said that the scriptures sink into silence when the Vedanta appears, even as foxes do not raise their voice in the forest when the lion appears."[42]

This is not racial arrogance nor false claim. "The Hindu thought has no mistrust of reason."[43] "The Hindu philosophy of religion starts", Radhakrishnan submits, "from and returns to an experimented basis, is as wide as human nature itself. . . The Hindu thinkers readily admits other points of view than his own and considers them to be just as nothing of attention. . . When Hindu found that different people aimed at and achieved God realisation in different ways, he generally recognised them all and justified their place in the course of history. . . Every tradition which helps man to lift his soul to God is held up as worthy of adherence. Hinduism is therefore not a definite creed, but a vast, complex, and subtly unified mass of spiritual thought and realisation. Its tradition of the god-ward endeavour of the human spirit has been continuously enlarging through the ages."[44]

"We see that the Hindu recognises one supreme spirit, though different names are given to it. In his social economy he has many castes, but one society. In the population there are many races and tribes, but all are bound together by one common spirit. Though different forms of marriage are permitted, there is only one ideal aimed at. There is a unity of purpose underlying the multitudinous ramifications."[45] "The Hindu thinkers reckoned with the striking fact that the men and women dwelling in India belonged to different communities worshipped different rites" as evident from Kumbh Purana. As if so much catholicity were not enough, Radhakrishnan wonders, "outsiders have been pouring into the country from the beginning of its history, and some have made for themselves a home in India and thus increased difficulty of the problem"[46] of communalism.

Radhakrishnan did not agree that the caste factor was a divisive, stumbling block in the way of Hindu consolidation. Quoting 'Shanti Parva' of Mahabharata he held that caste is a question of character. One becomes a Brahmin by his deeds, not by his family or birth; even a 'Chandala' (untouchable) is a Brahmin if he is of pure character. Some of the great 'risis' (sages) worshipped by the Brahmins are of half castes and hybrids. Vashistha was born of a prostitute, he recalls, and Vyasa of a fisher-woman, Parasára of a 'Chandala' girl.[47]

Following the logic of ancestry of the Indian people, Radhakrishnan remarks regarding the Muslims : "To change one's creed is not to cut oneself from the past of one's country or its ideals."[48] Pertaining to Indian Christians he observes, they breathe the same spiritual air laden with the fragrance of India's past, as their Hindu brethren.[49] He was deeply hurt by the treatment accorded to Hinduism in missionary institutions.[50]

True to the Hindu tradition, Radhakrishnan upholds the universalistic approach. To him, the Hindu never doubted the reality of one supreme universal spirit. He studied that the prophets have dreamed of the unity of mankind from the beginning of the world. The Hindus speak of "swadesho bhubanam trayam". He has stuck to the great Indian tradition of Vedanta and has succeeded in demonstrating the fundamental spiritual unity of all beings, particularly mankind.[51] He recalls Rig Veda which spells: "Earth bearing folk of many a varied language.... In consort may those creatures yield us blessing.[52] He also recalls Bhagvat Gita which lays stress on human brotherhood, and interprets the concept of "lok sangraha" as world solidarity.[53] "Tad eva isvarajujanam", which means, we worship the creator by working for a new creation, a new society."[54] Under this backdrop he hopes that the goal of world unity is to be achieved by the world view insisted on by Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism.[55] He also recalls Buddha who sought to establish the kingdom of righteousness in the whole world, 'Dharma

Rajya'.[56] He further justifies that India's conquest have never been political but spiritual and cultural.[57]

Radhakrishnan greatly hailed the Hindu nationalists. In reference to Vivekananda he writes, his (Radhakrishnan's) pride as a Hindu was "roused by the enterprise and eloquence of Swami Vivekananda."[58] Regarding Sister Nivedita he remarks, "She was a strong nationalist. . . Her books on 'Religion and Dharma', 'The Web of Indian Life'. . . are inspired writings."[59]

In his inspiring works 'Our Heritage', 'The Heart of Hindusthan', 'Religion and Culture' (which were of course speeches in different occasions), 'The Hindu View of Life' beside many others Radhakrishnan has added a new dimension to buttress the cause of Hindu nationalism. He eulogised Hinduism in his writings in the most erudite form, admired the great achievements of India's past in the realm of religion, culture, literature, philosophy and what not; and carefully combined the geo-cultural basis of Hinduism and Indianness in sublime form. To touch a piece—he expressed in one of his addresses, "The Mahabharata is not merely a historic work but it reflects the dynamic culture of India. . . If India possesses a fundamental unity far more profound than what her geographical isolation or political history suggests, it is due to the influence of this great epic. The unity transcends diversities of race, colour, language and sect".[60]

Proud of the hoary past of India, Radhakrishnan recalls certain gifts of India to the world. It has contributed a lot in the realm in intellect and culture. In this discourse he cites a small instance—that Plato received inspiration from the Kathopinishad the dictum that the administration should be guided by the spiritual consideration.[61] Further Radhakrishnan quotes Manu claiming that all the people of the world learn from leaders of this country the lessons for their behaviour.[62]

Radhakrishnan interprets secularism in the trend

of Hindu nationalism. He categorically states that secularism is the chief weakness of our age.[63] To him, secularism does not mean denial and rejection of the Supreme.[64] Every civilisation is the expression of a religion, for religion signifies faith in absolute values and a way of life to realise them.[65] He did not see religion to be divorced from the perceptible society. To him, "Dharma is not a fixed code of mechanical rules, but a living spirit which grows and moves in response to the development of society.[66] In 1955 he wrote, "It may appear somewhat strange that our Government should be secular one while our culture is rooted in spiritual values. . . Secularism here does not mean irreligious or atheism or even stress on the universality of spiritual values which may be attached by a variety ways".[67] This also follows his opposition to materalism, and for that matter, Marxism. In his words, "Light and darkness negate each other. But distincts, like truth and beauty, philosophy and art, do not exclude each other. If economic forces condition historic evolution it does not follow other forces. The forces of economic necessity, religious idealism and other forces and factors may interact and mould the future of history".[68]

Radhakrishnan is seriously concerned with 'Chaturvidha Purushartha' besetting Artha, Kama, Dharma and Moksha. He evokes harmonious role of these elements to be practised in human life. This conforms the ideal of Integral Humanism. In his writing, "The Individual and the Social Order in Hinduism" Radhakrishnan strikes a comparative and critical note on the role and position of the individual in East and West.[69]

It is widely believed that Radhakrishnan was primarily concerned with the theoretical disposition of Hinduism. But he was not forgetful of the ground reality of the problems of Indian nation, Hinduism and Hindu society. In 1942 he gave a clarion call: "We must now re-organise our religious thought and practice, if Hinduism

is to recover its conquering force and power to advance, penetrate and fertilise the world."[70] He considered seriously a plan for training youth persons to preach Hinduism at its best and more explicitly than before, spoke of giving modern civilisation a soul and men and women a principle to live by.[71] While the teachings of Hinduism seemed to him basically sound, he blamed its current abject condition. It is quite natural for a reformer who is concerned with the social malaise—all great Hindu reformers were rebels that way.

However, Radhakrishnan in his march to spearhead Hindu rejuvenation made the Hindu symbols and idioms familiar and dealt with the elements of nationality and the like on cultural paradigm. He recalls daily prayer of the regenerate Hindus and explains that "it asks for the protection of the cow and Brahmin symbols of the animal and the human worlds, nourishes of our bodies and souls respectively".[72] In similar strain he commented regarding Sanskrit that it "constitutes the basis, so to say, of almost all our cultures, of all our literatures."[73]

Further Radhakrishnan was not alienated from the burning problems like communalism, particularly hatched by the Muslims as indicated by his writing: "The development in any country depends upon its cultural tradition and national character."[74] Being imbued with Pan Islamism the Indian Muslims, he re-iterated, failed to make pace with native culture and tradition and due to this deficiency the Muslim League turned into an apologist of two nation theory. In 1944, Radhakrishnan was vocal against the disruptionist policy of the Muslim League.[75] In June 1945 Lord Wavell convened Shimla Conference where the Muslim League was accorded at par with the Congress but Hindu Mahasabha was conspicuously ignored. He regretted the omission of its leader Shyama Prasad Mukherjee from among the invitees.[76]

Thus Radhakrishnan's contribution goes a long way

in buttressing the conceptual cause of Hindu nationalism. He not merely evoked the elusive potent forces of Hinduism and the dimensions entailing it, but made exposition of them with intellectual sophistication. With full vigour of scholarship he constructed bridge between the underlying Indian national spirit, i.e., Hinduism and Indian land. His glorification of Indian culture, i.e., Hindu culture in most forceful form through his massive writings and addresses vindicate the stand of the Hindu nationalists pronounced since the days of renaissance. Though his area of activity was different he profoundly contributed to the cause in the form of disseminating his intellect even remaining in the august office of the land. The Hindu nationalist think-tank, conversely speaking, finds a great deal of treasure and strength from him, and this serves as a dose of elixir particularly when the apologists of secularism are mounting the horse. In view of intensity of originality and wisdom of Dr. Radhakrishnan, C.E.M. Joad entitles the life-philosophy sketched by him (on the former) as "Counter-Attack from the East", which may be rhetorically expressed within as "Counter-Attack from the Hindu nationalists".

Finally, Radhakrishnan's thought synthesises philosophy and history—a completely idealist approach, and draws a parallel between Indian nationalism and Hinduness being free from scholastic dogma and absolved from communal bias. His study is based on axiomatic truth and first hand information—a scholar of international repute par excellence, as a result of which he could get elevation to the highest office of the Indian republic even without grounding on electoral politics; and he could venture to at least contemplate shacking no less a person than Jawaharlal Nehru following "Himalayan blunder" (to use the expression of J.P. Dalvi) in northern border in 1962. In the same way he qualifies by himself the stature of the greatest intellectual on philosophical idealism pertaining to Hinduism, and obviously of Hinduness of India even without dabbling in the din and bustle of the organisational edifice of the

Hindu nationalists. If Savarkar's writings were more rhetoric that of Radhakrishnan's is more academic—sophisticated with scientific order.

Notes and References

1. Sharma, D.S., Great Indians: S. Radhakrishnan, Intr. p. 8.
2. Gopal, S., Radhakrishnan: A Biography, p. 382.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 202-04.
6. Sarhadi, A.S., Nationalism in India: The Problem, pp. 8-9.
7. Roy, S.K., The Political Thought of President Radhakrishnan, p. 89.
8. Verma, V.P., Modern Indian Political Thought, p. 418.
9. Rodrigues, Clarissa, The Social and Political Thought of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, p. 180.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
11. Radhakrishnan, S., Ed., Occasional Speeches and Writings (1959-62), p. 69.
12. Kamala Lectured by Radhakrishnan in Calcutta, December 1942; published as "Religion and Society", London, 1947, p. 81.
13. n. 11, p. 124.
14. n. 9, p. 182.
15. n. 11, p. 64.
16. Radhakrishnan, S., The Present Crisis of Faith, pp. 107, 118.
17. Radhakrishnan, S., Freedom and Culture, p. 7.
18. Radhakrishnan, S., Education, Politics and War, p. 197.
19. n. 17, p. 89.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 43-49.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
23. Radhakrishnan, S., The Hindu View of Life, p. 12.
24. Radhakrishnan treats the Aryan-Dravidian dichotomy in traditional pattern. Though a hypothesis, he rationalises it in right perspective.
25. n. 23, p. 12.
26. n. 1, p. 71.
27. Radhakrishnan, S., Eastern Religion and Western Thought, pp. 310-13.
28. n. 12, p. 130.
29. n. 23, p. 186.

30. Radhakrishnan, S., Religion and Culture, p. 29.
31. n. 27, p. 306.
32. n. 30, pp. 11-12.
33. n. 23, p. 129.
34. n. 27., p. 306.
35. n. 17, pp. 4-5.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
38. n. 12, p. 1028.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
40. n. 23, p. 92.
41. . . . so far as trying to put Hinduism in communitarian form.
42. n. 23, p. 18.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
48. Radhakrishnan, S., The Heart of Hindusthan, p. 59.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
50. n. 7., p. 84.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
52. n. 7, p. 170.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
55. n. 30, p. 28.
56. n. 11, p. 28.
57. n. 9, p. 183.
58. n. 7, p. 84.
59. "President Radhakrishnan's Speeches and Writings" (1964-69), p. 148.
60. Address at the inauguration of 'Anusunaparvan' of Maharashtra at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 22 September 1966, *Ibid.*, p. 149.
61. n. 7, p. 35.
62. n. 30, p. 28.
63. n. 12, pp. 20-24.
64. n. 9, p. 27.
65. n. 12, p. 21.
66. n. 48, p. 18.
67. Q., Talak, Kamal, "Secularism in India", in Padhi and Rao Ed., Socialism, Secularism and Democracy in India, p. 6.
68. Q., n. 7.
69. Hughes, E.R., Ed., The Individual in East and West, pp. 109-52.

70. n. 12, p. 138.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
72. n. 49, pp. 23-24.
73. Address inaugurating the Bharatiya Sahitya Parishad's Conference, New Delhi, 13 August 1966, p. 59, p. 224.
74. n. 48, p. 66.
75. n. 2, p. 182.
76. n. 12, p. 183.

TO END. . .

Number of thinkers subscribing the undergoing ethos and characteristics of Hindu nationalism are many more in the current century who stand beyond the circumscribed fort-line of the Hindu nationalist organisations. Rabindranath Tagore sang the Swadeshi songs in the first decade, and upheld the lofty ideals of Hinduism enriching Indian nationalism. He glorified Hindu Nation in his celebrated poem, "Devi Bhubana Mohini" as "the enchanting Goddess of the world. . . Her feet washed by the blue waters of the oceans."[1] Tamil poet Subramanya Bharati declared: "It is time to propagate the principles of Hinduness. There is none, other than Hindu race, to save humanism and set it on the right path". "I yearn to organise all the Hindus into our family", he proclaimed.[2] Sarat Chandra Chattopadhyay, outstanding Bangla novelist, clamoured: "Hindusthan is the land of the Hindus. . . (whereas) Muslims are sitting here with their face turned towards Arabia and Turkey."[3] Celebrated Oriya poet and mass leader Pandit Gopabandhu Das recalled, emulating Bankim Chandra, three images of Mother India. He glorified in his compositions the Hindus of having destined to sacrifice their blood for the cause of humanity.[4]

From among the public men of high stature, Surendranath Banerjee held that the ancient Hindus themselves did write their own history and did thus exhibit the consciousness of their identity as a group which nationalist ideology now requires in the form of a nation.[5]

Reference on Chittaranjan Das has earlier been made in the context of Subhas Chandra Bose. He identified Indian nationalism distinct from western variant—that the former is of cultural and spiritual components.[6] Veteran freedom fighter, M.R. Jaykar was in every way a Hindu nationalist.[7] Name of Chakraborty Rajgopalachari shines radiant in the galaxy of recent epoch of India. He contributed much sought 'Ramayana' and 'Mahabharata' in concise prose form—easily accessible to common reader. More conspicuous is the fact that his writings in entirety are embedded and embellished with Hindu culture and Hindu idioms. K.M. Munshi, a stalwart of anti-colonial struggle and founder of Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan has contributed to the same cause to the highest degree.

From among the scholars and statesmen, Bhagwan Das, the recipient of Bharat Ratna award, was an outspoken Hindu rejuvenist. He earnestly pleaded that the future should preserve the essence of the soul of ancient India.[8] Another revered personage in the present context is Satyadev Parivrajak. He preached the glories of ancient Aryan culture, and was a vigorous champion of Hindu solidarity and rejuvenation. Brajendranath Seal, a contemporary of Swami Vivekananda, was a great idealist metaphysician, and Krishna Chandra Bhattacharya was a great theologian of Vedanta school.[9] From among the great historians Radhakumud Mukherjee, R.C. Mazumdar and K.M. Panikar obviously shared perception of the Hindu nationalists. Journalists like late Girilal Jain's writings are memorable. Of late, Russi Karanjia, who was a high priest of the temple of dialectical materialism realised at the age of seventy-five the great contents of the Vedas and Upanishads and set himself free from the "spectre of Hindutva" haunting his thinking.

From among the current politicians Dr. Karan Singh occupies a special place. Though a Congress man of Nehruvian era he made his distinction felt. Even he attracted Jawaharlal Nehru to contribute Foreword in his "Prophet of Indian Nationalism", which is on Aurobindo

Ghose, whose nationalist thought was criticised by Nehru in 1907 while in Cambridge. Karan Singh also shared the platform with Vishva Hindu Parishad in 1982 in Delhi addressing a mammoth Hindu congregation. But he is known more as an authority on Hindu culture. His "Essays on Hinduism" is commendable. To quote (his) one sentence—"It is true that throughout her long history it is Hinduism that set the tone of national culture in India, that acted as the great creative force behind most of her varied achievements, that provided the ethos, the cultural milieu, the backdrop, as it were, against which the drama of her history was played out."[10]

The list may proceed considerably. Many publications, institutions as well as individuals in different walks of life have contributed to the cause of Hindu nationalism. There is scarcely any scope to deliberate on the area and justification of Hindu nationalism in the present volume, which had already been done earlier. But while delving deep on the contributions of all the thinkers, leaders, statesmen so far discussed, they have unleashed their mark in two-fold ways. First, they have enriched the Hindu culture, traditions, values and whatever it entails. They did not view it as mere sectarian religion meant for worshipping, as the secularist intellectuals would readily fasten the expression "Hindu communalism", and even as "Hindu chauvinism."[11] A stage has come when Hinduism is considered as a mater of private concern, and Hinduism in public is rank medievalism and primordial detrimental to the foundation of secular India! Historically this kind of "secular India" is built on the debris of medieval invasions and British colonialism. In other words, this secular India concept and practice is vindication of the thousand years of plunder, destruction and enslavement. Their plea is that we shall have to bear history. To the contrary, the Hindu nationalists give clarion call to face history. Savarkar has already been quoted at the beginning saying a nation ought to be the master of its history not its slave. The mendicant attitude of the earlier moderates tried to

marginalise the essence of Indian nationalism, strengthened the British rule (in the form of constitutional reform), and made the people sluggish; while the extremists made the people virulent and took cause of the basic substratum of Indian nationalism. The same kind of drama is being enacted in post-independence India, but in high profile. It seems that the Hindu secularists have become more communal than even the Muslim League.

Well, the point is in the context of the great benefactors of Hindu nationalism who tried to enrich Hindu values. Secondly, they have assiduously constructed deep underlying fundamental liaison of Hinduness and Indianness making abundant reference of history in its entirety, with careful estimate of national culture. This link-up is the bed-rock or the very essence of Hindu nationalist thought cropping up since the ages, i.e., when there was no nomenclature known as 'Hindu', but articulated earnestly since the later part of nineteenth century.

At the moment the notion of Hindu nationalism stands in the dock of the tribunal founded by the "left-progressive" and "liberal" intellectuals and the ruling class upholding the whole-sale import of territorial nationalism and curiously looking at the dissolution of "multi-national Indian federation" like the erstwhile Soviet Union! Hence it is of imperative urgency to roll the ball. This kind of secular communal divide is of later origin—particularly with the advent of the so-called left-progressive Moscow-based intellectuals. Entire concept of secularism was misfired—partly by historical chance and mostly by the debased leaders who were in the helm of affairs. But for Rajendra Prasad, Vallabh Bhai, Rajgopalachari axis the whole matter would have been more complicated. The course of Gandhian era unfortunately bypassed the Hindu nationalist organisations from the centre-stage owing to historical reasons and rather acquiesced the advent of the new denationalised forces of progressive brand as

pointed out. But the potential current of Hindu nationalism was yet making its presence felt within and without the edifice of Congress commonwealth.

To sum up the deliberation, when the process began with Dayananda-Bankim Chandra-Vivekananda stream there was no rebuke of having political end. But with the acceleration of the nationalist forces with dynamism different bogies were fielded as a matter of expediency and stratagem. The nationalists were coloured as Militants and Revivalists during the early phase of Indian National Congress. But the emergence of Gandhian era assumed the mainstream of the freedom struggle and a distinct political climate environed. When the Hindus were put at par with the Muslims in relation to Indian nationalism the Hindu nationalists were branded as communal. But ironically Gandhi himself, beside many of his followers as discussed, was the product of "Hindu India", at least in its philosophical lustre. But they compounded with this philosophy the historical questions, which give rise to the basis of Hindu nationalism. More irony is that while much academic acrobatic has been exercised in relation to the socialists, communists, liberals and other western ideologies mounting Indian scene, the historical-philosophical thinking of the Indian thinkers with indigenous value-system have been gravely marginalised—rather getting wrath contemptuously in unprecedented dimension. Its intensity can be conjectured from the fact that a young man passing from the University understands that nationalism is narrow, Hindu phenomenon is communal, culture is primordial and the like while appreciating everything of the West in order to earn the much coveted virtue of modernism! As a matter of pointer—some participants in the national seminar conducted by the Anthropology Department of Punjab University in Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla in June 1996, submitted that Aurangzeb was not anti-Hindu so much so that he destroyed few temples as he destroyed one or two mosques habitually. There is hardly any answer to these neo-Aurangzeb models of secular

intellectuals. It underlies the point that a time has reached when we are to legitimise the entire course of invasion, destruction and barbarism imprinted in the ignomious chapters of history! Their first attempt was, of course, to ignore it in order to construct a modern India. When the Hindu nationalists tried to re-read it, as natural for national awakening, the upholders of secularism embarked on the policy of defending the crimes of history —only in order to preserve, protect and defend the noble secularism (of their comprehension)!

Let the matter be contextual. The virtues of catholicity, inclusiveness and universality nurtured by the Congress Hindu nationalists is erroneously constructed as 'secular' in the prevailing notion of anti-Hindu nationalism. This systematic slogan-mongering phobia containing ambiguity, ambivalence and self-deception gave rise to the cult of pro-minoritism and anti-majoritarianism. In spite of pelting kick-backs it is the call of time to poke head on he short-term and long-term problems pertaining to Indian nationalism historically. The atmosphere has been so polluted and surcharged that it is obviously a herculean task. The factors of swadeshi, cultural nationalism, genuine secularism and the like are in the air completely polarising the entire political scenario at the moment and gaining mass and momentum everyday. Well, these may be agenda of some political party, but mid-night oil cannot be burnt to dismiss the concept under this excuse. Much erosion and pitfalls have already been accumulated for the sake of political compulsion and expediency of electoral politics. It is time to rise beyond the corridor of party politics.

There is, of course, ample scope here to invite scolding that selective subjective reading have been made in the present work with predilection to postulate a preconceived notion. But let the mirror be placed before their face, which would be defaced in no time. With due apology, this kind of offensive posture has become imperative along with defensive. As it is rightly said that

offense is the best defence. While it is inept to project some personality to suit one's thinking, "the other side" must be probed and highlighted to dispel the distortion of high magnitude. The factor of critical reasoning is not the monopoly of one side. Is it not travesty of truth to claim that the prevailing pattern of secularism is the offshoot of Gandhism? Is it correct to attribute that Subhas Bose was a communist? or for that matter Ambedkar was an anti-Hindu? or to just cast a cursory glance at Radhakrishnan and say—well he was mere a philosopher to be confined in library shelves. The predicament of this category of intellectuals is that they are scared of re-reading and to resort to have fresh appraisal. They are constraint to be dogmatic even holding the beacon of "critical reasoning". Precisely, they are prisoners of own prejudices.

No nation disowns its own think-tanks as the Indian intellectuals at the moment have done. This way of thinking was steadily created during the anti-colonial struggle when the Nationalists waned and the import-variety waxed. The ball is yet rolling, but ironically with more vigour, which means with more aberration. In every country following liberation from colonial shackle the intellectuals have devoted themselves to re-order their history and culture. It is natural for the colonial master to distort them in order to maintain their psychological superiority and consequent political hegemony. But India is perhaps the only exception which failed to discover itself. In fact, there has been no discovery of India. India cannot be victim of western models and paradigms in the name of modernism, which has become the beauty-parlour of the contemporary Indian social scientists competing hard to earn the much sought modernist appallation. They are so anxious to employ a model or system or ism set by the western counter-parts to suit their purpose! There is no harm in following others, but there must be indigenous scrutiny—there must be introspection for which Vivekananda gave a clarion call a century back. Conclusively, the objective here is not to pose any

western-Indian dichotomy. Knowledge is common property. But Indian perspective must be taken full consideration. Tilak and Aurobindo had set the example that originality and scholarship is not the monopoly of the West. India has potentiality to reckon with—but it can hardly be explored with sheepish mentality. In one's zeal to modernise nobody can uproot himself.

The crux of the present discourse is that the nationalistic question is the vitality of building Indian nation; and all varied problems appearing under different garb can be buried with affirmation and resolve to usher into (further) renaissance taking serious note of emotional outburst or chauvinistic narrow stand. Trend of Indian nationalism and its entailing forces have greatly suffered set back, and the nation can withstand no more. This assertion has been repeated since it is the fundamental truth. This flow is to be reversed in right perspective, of course, re-inforced with reflective critical reasoning, notwithstanding challenges from any quarter. Empiricism is the fountain of critical reasoning, and let it be employed for this noble cause in order to spearhead (post) renaissance benefiting Indian nationalism in particular and the world order in general.

* * * * * * *

ADDENDUM

While the present work was undergoing typing a bombshell was exploded by the Chairman of the Minority Cell of Congress, that 90% of the Muslims of India were unaware of the demand of Pakistan, that only 5% of them voted for the Muslim League and that too for the candidate and the party and not necessarily for partition, and that RSS-Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League were guilty of partition.[12] This kind of guess work with false factual data has picked up momentum of late—perhaps in order to strengthen secularism of their thinking! The question raised has been dealt with Volume one of the

present work, yet a little clarification is imperative which may add to the lustre of the context. Let certain extract of C.H. Philips and M.D. Wainwright be quoted to answer it: ". . . the essential element in ensuring the success of the League was for it to obtain control of the Muslims in the majority provinces. . . Muslims were in a majority in certain parts of the sub-continent that the idea of Pakistan could be put forward. But unless the Muslims in those areas were behind the movement there could be no possibility of its achievement. . . It is therefore suggested that. . . the outcry against Hindu 'atrocities' and the whole experience of Congress rule attracted much retrospective attention. . . that the League now had the support of the Muslims in the majority provinces as well as those in the minority provinces was demonstrated in the 1945 elections . . . It is hard to believe that thereafter anything less than Pakistan could permanently have satisfied the Muslim community."[13] Regarding the election of 1945-46 the Indian Annual Register provides statistics thus; that the Muslim League secured 86% of the votes cast in Muslim constituencies and won 30 seats for the Central Legislative Assembly, and won 427 of the 507 Muslim seats.[14] Massive works have been done on the subject by no less personalities like Rajendra Prasad (India Divided), B.R. Ambedkar (Thoughts on Pakistan), Ram Manohar Lohia (Guilty Men of India's Partition) beside veteran scribes like Lary Collins and Dominique Lapperie (Freedom at Midnight) and academician like Prof. M.N. Das (The Last Days of British Empire: The Policy of Divide and Quit) which provide abundant light for soul searching.

If one analyses the addresses of Jinnah during 1940-47 it is found that he has not uttered the names of RSS or Hindu Mahasabha which are supposed to have ignited his hemanship springing into action.[15] RSS was at its adolescent stage then. Further, as for the Hindu Mahasabha, V.D. Savarkar was in the helm of affairs during 1938-44 and later Shyama Prasad Mukherjee carried the mantle. In none of their addresses they

accepted the two-nation theory; rather they were the principal crusaders against the proposal of partition. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee was so uncompromising on the issue that he was carefully side-lined from the Shimla talk of 1945 which in one way acquiesced the partition by soft-peddling with the Muslim League. One critic (dealt in Volume one) has apportioned responsibility of partition on Savarkar—that he envisioned partition two years earlier than Jinnah did. While there is no iota of truth in the form of evidence, the critic probably confuses Savarkar's theory of 'Hindutva' as meaning to divide the nation. Thee is no greater folly than this. Savarkar's doctrine of Hindutva first came to lime-light in 1924. It spells the Hindu substratum of Indian nationalism. It defines India as the land stretched from Himalayas to the Indus sea. It venerates India as a living entity—a holy land. The analysis goes on. Does it tend to partition? The critic might feel that it provoked the Muslims. Then let him appease the latter! Appeasement was compromised with nationalism and paved the way for partition.

Further, if somebody voted for the Muslim League as a political party or its candidate by person it is not to be excused since the candidate's party spearheaded the cause of partition. Well, this kind of acrobatic must not be stretched ahead. Post-partition Muslims of India and particularly the present generation cannot be tarnished for it. But unfortunately the critics on the other side are raising questions of very delicate taste and it must be answered though insipid it may be. Facts remain as it is—history cannot be washed away; but everything depends on interpretation. Indian variant of liberal secular intellectuals are so incorrigible that they proceed unabated with their habitual distortions—the perfect case of self-deception.

So long as the pluralistic notion of Indian nationalism is in the mind the case of Pakistan—that is the dismemberment of India must be haunting. The author has noticed the confidence motion tabled by Atal Bihari

Vajpayee on 28 May 1996, when P. Chidambaram stole the show in raising the factor of pluralism. Are Tirupati, Rameswaram, Kanyakumari not integral part of cultural India? What about Bharat Natyam? For that matter, Kanchipuram 'Sari'. What about the contributions of Ramanuja, Vallabhacharya, Rajgopalachari, Radhakrishnan and Subramanya Bharati? P. Chidambaram repeated his version in Lok Sabha at the time of confidence motion moved by H.D. Devagwoda. Let us have introspection what culture is, what is the basis of Indian nationalism? and the like. If conceptual foundation is not transparent the follow up confusions are constraint to eat into the vitals.

Notes and References

1. Golwalkar, M.S., Bunch of Thoughts, p. 669.
2. Q., Malkani, K.R., The RSS Story, pp. 75-76.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
4. Pattanaik, D.D., Indian Political Tradition, pp. 283-84.
5. Kedouri, Elic, Ed., Nationalism in Asia and Africa, p. 1.
6. Ghose, Shankar, Leaders of Modern India, p. 256.
7. Jaykar, M.R., The Story of My Life, Vol. 1. Also commented by Leonard, Gordon, Brothers Against the Raj, p. 265.
8. Das, Bhagwan, "Spiritual Purity", Dayananda Commemorative Volumes, Ajmer, 1933, pp. 77-103.
9. Verma, V.P., Modern Indian Political Thought, pp. 403-07.
10. Singh, Karan, Prophet of Indian Nationalism, p. 15.
11. "Muslim India" edited by Shahbuddin, Syed.
12. "The Asian Age", Calcutta, 17 June 1997.
13. Philips, C.H., and Wainwright, M.D., The Partition of India, Intr., p. 39.
14. Indian Annual Register, Vol. I, pp. 229-31.
15. ". . . It is also interesting to remember that although in 1947, the RSS was at the peak of its power, neither Mahatma Gandhi nor Jinnah spoke one word against RSS". (Malkani, K.R., "The New Age: Renaissance in Cultural Nationalism", *The Times of India*, 21 October 1977, p. 12).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Beside the relevant books mentioned in previous Volumes).

Ahir, D.C., Dr. Ambedkar on Buddhism, Siddharth Publication, Bombay, 1st edn., 1982.

Ahluwalia, B.K., Sardar Patel: A Life, Sagar Publications, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1974.

Ambedkar, B.R., Thoughts on Pakistan, Thackar and Co., Bombay, 1st edn., 1941.

———, Pakistan, or Partitioning of India, Thackar and Co., Bombay, 2nd edn., 1945.

———, Who were the Shudras? Thackar and Co., Bombay, 3rd edn., 1970.

———, Gandhi and Gandhism, Bheem Patrika Publication, Jullundhar (year of publication not mentioned).

Appadorai, A., Indian Political Thinking Through the Ages, Khanna Publishers, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1992.

Bharati, K.S., The Philosophy of Sarvoday, Indus Publishing Company, Delhi, 1st edn., 1990.

Bimla Prasad, Socialism, Sarvoday and Democarcy, Selected works of Jay Prakash Narain, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1st edn., 1964.

Bhave, Vinoba, Revolutionary Sarvoday, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1st edn., 1964.

———, Sarvoday and Communism, A Sarvoday Publication (other information not mentioned—Source—National Library, Calcutta).

Bose, Subhas Chandra, An Indian Pilgrim: An Unfinished

Autobiography and Collected Letters (1897-1921), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, edn. not mentioned, 1965.

Bose, Subhas Chandra, The Indian Struggle, Sterling Publications, New Delhi, 1976.

———, Cross-roads, Netaji Research Bureau, Calcutta, 2nd edn., 1981.

———, Fundamental Questions of Indian Revolution, Netaji Research Bureau, Calcutta, 1st edn., 1978.

———, The Mission of Life, Spink & Co., Calcutta, 1st edn., 1953.

———, Netaji Speaks: A Collection of Speeches and Writings, Vol. One, Jayshree Prakashan, Calcutta, 1st edn., 1973.

Bose, S.K., Werth, Alexander, Ayer, A.S., A Beacon Across Asia: A Biography of Subhas Chandra Bose, Orient Longman, Bombay, 1st edn., 1973.

Bose, S.K. and Bose, S., The Essential Writings of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1st edn., 1997.

Bright, J.S., Ed., Important Speeches and Writings of Subhas Chandra Bose, The Indian Printing Works, Lahore, 1st edn., 1946.

Chakraborty, Bidyut, Subhas Chandra Bose and Middle Class Radicalism: A Study in Indian Nationalism, 1928-40, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1st edn., 1990.

Chattopadhyay, S.C., Subhas Chandra Bose: Man, Mission and Means, pub., the author, Minerva Associates (Publication) Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1st edn., 1989.

Chauchereck, K.L., Ed., Dr. B.R. Ambedkar: A Centenary Volume Publication, H.K. Publishers and Distributors, Delhi, 1st edn., Vols. 1, 2.

Chaudhuri, Valmiki, Ed., Dr. Rajendra Prasad: Correspondence and Select Documents, Vol. 6, Allied Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1986.

Das, Bhagwan, Intr., Thus Spoke Ambedkar, Bheem Patrika Prakashan, Jullundhar, Vol. II, (Year not mentioned).

Das, Durga, Ed., Sardar Patel's Correspondence, 1945-50, Navajivan Publishing House, 1st edn., Vols. I, II, 1971; Vol. III, 1972, Vols. IV, V, VI, VII, 1973.

Fischer, Louis, The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, Happar and New Publishers, New York, 1st paperback edn., 1983.

———, The Essential Gandhi: An Autobiography, George Allen and Unwin Limited, 1st edn., 1963.

Gandhi, M.K., An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiment with Truth, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, 2nd edn., 1969 (Reprinted).

———, Hind Swaraj, Navjivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, edn. not mentioned, 1938.

———, Hindu Dharma, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1st edn., reprinted, 1947.

———, My Religion, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 2nd edn., 1957.

———, In Search of the Supreme, Vol. I, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 2nd edn., 1961.

———, To the Hindus and Muslims, Gandhi Series, Vol. III, Ed. and Pub. by Anand T. Hingorani, Karachi, 1st edn., 1942.

———, Young India (Supplement), Ganeshan, S., Triplican, Madras, 1st edn., 1924.

Guha, Samar, The Mahatma and Netaji: Two Men of Destiny of India, Sterling Publishing Private Limited, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1986.

Gopal, S., Radhakrishnan: A Biography, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1st edn., 1989.

Gordon, Leonard, Brothers Against the Raj: A Biography of Sarat and Subhas Chandra Bose, Viking, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1987.

Handa, R.L., Rajendra Prasad: Twelve Years of Triumph and Despair, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2nd ed., 1979.

Hughes, E.R., Ed., The Individual in East and West, Oxford University Press, London, 1st edn., 1937.

Jaykar, M.R., The Story of My Life, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, Vol. One, 1st edn., 1958.

Joad, Cyril Edwin Michinson, Counter-Attack from the

East: The Philosophy of Radhakrishnan, George Allen, London, 1st edn., 1933.

Kripalani, J.B., Gandhi: His Life and Thought, Publications Division, GOI, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1970.

Lalkarna, K.K, Mahatma Gandhi—Contribution to Hinduism, Classical Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1981.

Lokhande, G.S., Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar: A Study in Social Democracy, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1977.

Lemaye, Madhu, Prime Movers: Role of the Individual in History, Radiant Publishers, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1985.

Mazumdar, S.K., Evolution of Netaji: The Warrior Prophet of India, Netaji Research Bureau, Calcutta, 1969.

Merriam, A.H., Gandhi *vs.* Jinnah, Minerva Associates (Publications) Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1st edn., 1980.

Moon, Vasant, Comp., Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar's Writings and Speeches, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, Vol. 1, 1989, Vol. 7, 1990, Vol. 9, 1996.

Narain, Iqbal, Joshi, Ram, Hebsur, R.K., Ed., A Centenary History of the Indian National Congress, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1st edn., 1989.

Narain Rao, J.S., B.R. Ambedkar: His Relevance Today, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1994.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, A Bunch of Old Letters, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1st edn., 1938.

Patil, V.T., Ed., Studies on Gandhi, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1st edn., 1983.

Pattanaik, D.D., Political Philosophy of Subhas Chandra Bose, Associated Publishers, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1991.

Philips, C.H., and Weinwright, Mary Doren, Ed., The Partition of India: Politics and Perspectives, 1935-47, George Allen and Union Ltd., London, 1st edn., 1968.

Pradhan, B., The Socialist Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, G.D.K. Publications, Delhi, Vols. I, II, 1st edn., 1980.

Radhakrishnan, S., Religion and Society, George Allen

and Unwin, London, 2nd edn., 1948.
———, The Heart of Hindusthan, G.A. Natesan and Co., Madras, 1st edn., 1932.

Radhikrishnan, R., The Present Crisis of Faith, Orient Paperbacks, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1970, 11th Reprint, 1992.

———, The Hindu View of Life, Unwin Books, London, 2nd Impression, 1969.

———, Religion and Culture, Orient Paperbacks, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1968, 15th Reprint, 1991.

———, Our Heritage, Vision Books Private Limited, Delhi, 1st edn., 1973.

———, Freedom and Culture, G.A. Natesan and Co., Madras, 1st edn., 1936.

———, "Speeches and Writings", Second Series (1964-67), Publications Division, GOI, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1969.

Rajendra Prasad, India Divided, Hind Kitab, Bombay, 1st edn., 1946.

———, Autobiography, Asia Publishing House, 1st edn., 1958.

———, At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1st edn., 1961.

———, Legacy of Gandhiji, Shivala Agrawal and Co. (P) Ltd. Publishers, Delhi, 1st edn., 1962.

———, Mahatma Gandhi and Bihar: Some Reminiscence, Hind Kitab Ltd., Bombay, 1st edn., 1949.

Raghavan, G.N.S., Making of Modern India, Ram Mohan to Gandhi and Nehru, Gian Publishing House, Delhi, 1st edn., (Year of publication not mentioned).

Rodrigues, Clarissa, The Social and Political Thought of Dr. Radhakrishnan, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1992.

Rolland, Romain, Mahatma Gandhi, Shivalal Agarwal & Co. Ltd., Agra, 1st Indian print, 1977.

Roy, S.K., The Political Thought of President Radhakrishnan, Pub., Mukhopadhyay, K.L., Calcutta, 1st edn., 1966.

Risley, Sir Herbert, The People of India, Oriental Books Reprint Corporations, Delhi, 2nd edn., 1965.

Sankhdher, M.M., Gandhi, Gandhism and the Partition of India, 1st edn., Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1982.

Sankhdher, M.M., Understanding Gandhi Today, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1996.

Savarkar, V.D., The Indian War of Independence, Pub. Mayuresh, London, 1st English edn., 1909.

Shankar, V., My Reminiscences of Sardar Patel, The Macmillan Company of India, 1st edn., Vols. I, II, 1975.

———, Ed., Sardar Patel: Correspondence, Vol. 1, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1st edn., 1977.

Saxena, Kiran, Modern Indian Political Thought: Gandhism and Roy's New Humanism, Chetna Publications, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1978.

Shukla, J.J., Dr. B.R. Ambedkar on Hinduism, Globe Books and Periodicals, Ahmedabad, 1st edn., 1993.

Tahtien, Unto, Core of Gandhi's Philosophy, Abhinav Publications, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1979.

Tendulkar, D.G., Mahatma: Life and Works of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Publications Division, GOI, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1951, Reprinted, 8 Volumes.

Wadha, Madhuri, Gandhi between Tradition and Modernity, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1991.

INDEX

Ahmed, Sir Syed, 45
Anand Math, 32, 34
Aryan, 29
Aryan Invasion, 66-67
Arya Samaj, 7, 68
Aurangzeb, 103
Aurobindo, 25, 84

Bahujan Samaj, 74
Banaras Hindu University, 83
Bankim Chandra, 24
Besant, Annie, 79
Bhave, Vinova, 11
Brahmo Samaj, 7, 68
Buch, M.A., 3
Buddha, 44, 68, 74-75

Congress Nationalists, 39, 52

Das, Bhagwan, 100
Das, Chittaranjan, 32
Das, Gopabandhu, 99
Das, M.N., 107
Dayananda, 40, 103

Gordon, Leonard, 34
Graham, B.D., 55

Hedgewar, Dr., 18, 77
Hindutva, 35
Hindu Code Bill, 47, 68
Hindu Mahasabha, 14, 41, 45, 94, 106
Hindu Sabha, 41

Indo-Aryan, 66

Jayakar, M.R., 39, 100
Jinnah, Mahammad Ali, 16, 20
Joad, C.E.M., 95

Kathopanishad, 92

Lohia, Ram Manohar, 109
Lucknow Congress, 53

Malaviya, Madan Mohan, 41, 83
Marx, Karl, 31
Mazumdar, R.C., 2
Moonje, Dr. B.S., 14
Mukherjee, Radha Kumud, 2
Mukherjee, Shyama Prasad, 14, 94, 107
Muslim League, 52, 106
Muslim Invasion, 69-71
Munshi, K.M., 39, 59, 100

Narain, Jay Prakash, 6
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 27, 49, 58, 100
Nivedita, Sister, 7

Panikar, K.M., 2, 4
Prarthana Sabha, 68
Rajgopalachari, C., 102

Ramakrishna, 24
Ramananda, 89
Ram Raj, 10
Rig Veda, 85
Russel, Bertrand, 72
RSS, 19, 35, 55, 57-58, 62, 77

Savarkar, V.D., 14, 82, 107
Sarvodaya, 12
Secularism, 94
Singh, Karan, 100
Swadeshi, 99
Swaraj, 10

Tilak, Balgangadhar, 7, 25, 32

Vajpayee, Atal Bihari, 108
Vivekananda, 7, 18, 24, 40, 79, 82, 84, 103